

Sacris Erudiri

Journal of Late Antique and Medieval Christianity

LII
2013

BREPOLS

Published with the financial support of
“Encyclopédie bénédictine”

Sacris Erudiri is indexed or abstracted in (inter alia) the printed (and, where appropriate, electronic) bibliographies of *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, *L'Année Philologique*, *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes*, *Analecta Bollandiana*, the *International Medieval Bibliography* and *Medioevo latino: bollettino bibliografico della cultura europea dal secolo VI al XIII*.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

© 2014 – BREPOLS  PUBLISHERS n.v., Turnhout (Belgium)

D/2014/0095/59
ISBN 978-2-503-54387-1
ISSN 0771-7776

Sacris Erudiri
Journal of Late Antique and Medieval Christianity

Sacris Erudiri
Journal of Late Antique and Medieval Christianity

Founded by Dom Eligius Dekkers († 1998)

Editorial Board

R. Beyers	G. Declercq	M. Lamberigts	B. Meijns
G. Partoens	P. Van Deun	P. Van Nuffelen	W. Verbaal

Editor-in-Chief

J. Leemans

Publishing Manager

B. Janssens

Advisory Board

P. Allen	P. Bourgain	H. Brandenburg	M. Cacouros	G. Constable
G. Di Maria	F. Dolbeau	U. Kindermann	C.H. Kneepkens	M. Lapidge
E.A. Matter	B. Neil	G. Quicke	P. Stotz	J. Van Engen

All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor-in-Chief:

Prof. Dr. Johan Leemans
KU Leuven , Faculteit Theologie en Religiewetenschappen
OE Geschiedenis van Kerk en Theologie
Ch. Deberiotstraat 26 – bus 3101
B-3000 Leuven (Belgium)
johan.leemans@theo.kuleuven.be

Sacris Erudiri publishes articles in all major European languages.
Norms for publication are available at www.corpuschristianorum.org/series/se.html
This journal does not publish any reviews.

Subscriptions and back issues should be ordered directly from the publisher.

Table of Contents

Tristan MAJOR, The Number Seventy-two: Biblical and Hellenistic Beginnings to the Early Middle Ages.....	7
Maria VERHOEFF, A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor: John Chrysostom's Discourse on Almsgiving Reinterpreted ..	47
Joost VAN NEER, Structure and Argument in Augustine's Nativity Sermons 184 and 185: Two Sermons with a Division into Three Parts.....	67
Robert WIŚNIEWSKI, Local and Overseas Saints and Religious Identity in Vandal Africa	103
Richard W. BISHOP, <i>Homilia in Pentecosten</i> (CPG 6665): A Sermon of Basil of Seleucia	119
René ROUX, Merkmale der theologischen Argumentation in den Katechetischen Homilien des Severus von Antiochien.....	161
Rainer JAKOBI, Unidentifizierte karolingische Sedulius-Glossen..	181
Nathan J. RISTUCCIA, The Herwagen Preacher and his Homiliary	187
Jean GROSFILLIER, Quelques considérations sur l'influence du <i>De contemplatione</i> de Richard de Saint-Victor.....	235
Carsten WOLLIN, <i>Non est crimen amor</i> . Lateinische Liebesdichtung im Umkreis des Petrus Abaelardus	275
Marie-Geneviève GROSSEL, Hélinand avant Froidmont: à la recherche d'un « trouvère » perdu	319
Corneille H. KNEEPKENS, The Odyssey of the Manuscripts of Helinand's <i>Chronicon</i>	353
Meindert GEERTSMA, Helinand's <i>De Bono Regimine Principis</i> : A Mirror for Princes or an Exegesis of Deuteronomy 17, 14-20?	385

The Number Seventy-two: Biblical and Hellenistic Beginnings to the Early Middle Ages¹

Tristan MAJOR

(Vancouver)

Vnde ratio numeri contemnenda non est.
Augustine, *De ciuitate Dei*²

1. General Introduction

The fact that numbers play an immensely important role in European literature scarcely needs to be mentioned. Particularly the numbers one to thirteen have attracted an inexhaustible array of literary uses from general rhetorical structures to specific symbolism, and both scholars and amateurs of the various fields of the social sciences and humanities have discussed, to great lengths, the significance of number symbolism in past and present cultures.³ Despite this attention, such endeavors very often result in vague presentations of number symbolism grounded in absolute examples across broad literary periods or genres. For only one example, Annemarie Schimmel's translation and revision of Franz Carl Endres' book, *The Mystery of Numbers* (German *Mysterium der Zahl*, 1984) gives an indispensable account of the primary symbolic significance associated with numbers one to one thousand, but becomes frustrating in its methodological approach: in its main section entitled "A Little Dictionary of Numbers" the author lists the various symbolism attached to the appropriate numbers, but gives little to no sense how precise number symbols relate to other number

¹ This research was supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Canada. I would like to thank Andy Orchard, Michael Elliot, Toni Healey, Carol Percy, Jennifer Pfenniger, Andy Scheil, and Gernot Wieland for their comments.

² Aug., *Ciu.*, XI.xxx.31-32, p. 350 (= S. Aurelius Augustinus, *De ciuitate Dei libri I-X / libri XI-XXII* – ed. B. DOMBART – A. KALB, Turnhout, 1955 [CC SL, 47-48]).

³ For example, see V.F. HOPPER, *Medieval Number Symbolism: Its Sources, Meaning, and Influence on Thought and Expression*, New York, 1938; E.R. CURTIUS, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* – trans. W.R. TRASK, New York, 1953, pp. 501-509; C. BUTLER, *Number Symbolism*, New York, 1970; and H. MEYER, *Die Zahlenallegorese im Mittelalter: Methode und Gebrauch*, Munich, 1975.

symbols or how they have developed according to individual authors, geographical locations or time frames. Since the numerical usage of one culture is mentioned alongside those of completely unrelated cultures, there develops an impression that the symbolism of a specific number (albeit in a wide range of forms) is an innate and universal feature of all cultures. Conclusions such as “the Christian concept of Trinity is perfectly in tune with general trends in the history of religions”⁴ are drawn with ease. But these conclusions remain problematic, emphasizing the use of a number across divergent cultures and downplaying its individual significance for a particular culture. In this example (which is synoptic of the book’s treatment in general), Schimmel’s methodology seems to give equal significance to triads “in the history of religions”, but as the evidence cited clearly indicates, not all triads are equal. The presence of threes in reference to Greek or Old Norse divinities does not have the same importance as it does for Christian theology. Undoubtedly, Schimmel’s list of symbolic numbers, as well as those in similar works, is invaluable as a reference tool, but these lists do tend to obscure a proper understanding of how number symbolism functions within a particular body of literature. And despite the abundance of excellent scholarly studies examining specific tropes, themes, allusions (etc) in various works of literature, some instances of number symbolism have been neglected.

The use and symbolism of the number seventy-two (and its occasional variances) play an important role in Christian literature of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, especially as the number of languages and nations in the world, the number of translators of the Septuagint, and the number of Christ’s disciples.⁵ Throughout the Middle Ages, these tallies became unquestionable and commonplace, even to the extent that a late-thirteenth-century Bolognese heretic could appeal to the number seventy-two to plead tolerance of religion.⁶ But this standard reckoning for the number of languages in the world and of Christ’s disciples developed over a long period of time, so long in fact that it sometimes seems as if it never actu-

⁴ A. SCHIMMEL, *The Mystery of Numbers*, New York, 1993, pp. 61-63. See also the similar comments in Hopper, *Medieval Number Symbolism*, p. 6 [n. 3].

⁵ A. BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel: Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*, 4 vols., Stuttgart, 1957-1963, esp. IV, 1967-69, 2017-19, who gives an impressive array of examples, is the standard study on the topic. H. SAUER, “Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Ein mittelalterlicher Topos in der englischen Literatur”, *Anglia*, 101 (1983), pp. 29-48; and *idem*, “Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Einige Ergänzungen”, *Anglia*, 107 (1989), pp. 61-64, provides material on Anglo-Saxon England. H.J. WEIGAND, “The Two and Seventy Languages of the World”, *The Germanic Review*, 17 (1942), pp. 241-260, focuses on German poetry, but also reviews some late antique Christian authors.

⁶ See BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 3 [n. 5].

ally stopped developing. Even as late as the fourteenth century, the Middle English *Cursor mundi* states that there are only sixty-two languages in the world.⁷ Furthermore, the number seventy-two, on account of its prominence as the number of languages and disciples, gained a certain significance that could be employed in other literary motifs, particularly for typological reasons. The number of biblical books, for instance, changed from seventy-one to seventy-two; the number of hours in the three day period (that is, seventy-two) became typologically significant; and greater canonical authority was placed on the consensus of seventy-two bishops. This study will examine the ways this number symbolism developed from its putative origins in the Table of Nations of Genesis 10 and the supposed number of translators of the Septuagint up to the works of Isidore of Seville in the seventh century. It aims to present a succinct survey of the issue to show not only the importance of the number seventy-two in antique and late antique intellectual traditions, but also more generally how complex and instable these traditions can be despite a professed reliance on the authority of the biblical text. In particular, this survey will reveal two broad stages of the development of the topos: for early Jewish and Christians authors the number, outside of its literal uses, had importance for its symbolic value, whereas for later Latin Christian authors the number, because of its ability to connect disparate elements through shared numerology, began to have importance for its typological value. This typological prominence can be detected as early as Irenaeus, but its fullest form does not arise until after Augustine, particularly in the writings of Isidore of Seville.

2. *The Table of Nations*

Although today the Tower of Babel narrative (Gen. 11,1-9) is one of the most recognized stories in the early chapters of Genesis, biblical interpreters of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages often found equal, if not more, significance in the related Table of Nations of the preceding chapter, which gives a list of the immediate descendants of the three sons of Noah.⁸

⁷ *The Southern Version of Cursor Mundi*, vol. 1 – ed. S.M. HORRALL, Ottawa, 1978, p. 2241. See B. MURDOCH, *The Medieval Popular Bible: Expansions of Genesis in the Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 2003, p. 139.

⁸ A similar list is found in 1 Chron. 1,4-26. The division of the Table of Nations of Genesis 10 proposed by WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des alten Testaments*, 4th ed., Berlin, 1963, pp. 6-7, remains the standard, though see also C. WESTERMANN, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* – trans. J.J. SCULLION, Minneapolis, 1984, pp. 495-530; J. SKINNER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 2nd ed., Edinburgh, 1930, pp. 187-223; and J. VAN SETERS, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*, Louisville, 1992, pp. 174-187. The division for chapter 10 is typically: P 1a, 2-7,

In light of Deuteronomy 32,8, “When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of men”,⁹ these interpreters viewed the Table of Nations as the list that recounted this “division” or “separation” of the “sons of men” and thereby supplied all the names of the original founders of the nations of the world. Each name in the Table, most often referring to an individual but occasionally a collective group, seems to represent one nation and, as it was consequently interpreted in light of the Tower of Babel narrative, one language. Despite the fact that textual issues and differences in the various translations make the numeration of names in the Table more complex than it initially seems, it is likely that symbolism involving the number seventy or seventy-two plays an important role throughout Genesis 10. Arno Borst sums up the issue well when he writes, “daß man auch die Völkerzahl der Welt in diesen Konnex [of the significance of the number seventy] bringen wollte—vielleicht nicht von Anfang an, aber doch recht früh—, scheint mir unbestreitbar”.¹⁰ But, as with much biblical interpretation, the standard count of names in the Table differed among later authors who dealt with Genesis 10: while early Jewish interpreters tended to claim that the number was seventy, likely because of the significance of the number seventy in Judaic thought, the Christians of Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages tended (with exceptions of course) to claim that the number was seventy-two.

In attempts to clarify the number symbolism, some scholars assert that if Nimrod (Gen. 10,8-12) is disregarded because he is not the founder of a nation, the sum total of all the eponymous names in the Hebrew Table of

20, 22-23, 31-32; J 1b, 8-19, 21, 24-30. For the clearest representation of the division of the chapter, see B. VAWTER, *On Genesis: A New Reading*, Garden City, NY, 1977, pp. 142-143, who presents the J additions in italics. For more recent literary analyses of the genealogies of Gen. 10, see T.D. ANDERSEN, “Genealogical Prominence and the Structure of Genesis”; and N.A. BAILEY, “Some Literary and Grammatical Aspects of Genealogies in Genesis”, in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* – ed. R.D. BERGEN, Dallas, TX, 1994, pp. 242-266, and 267-282; and F. CRÜSEMANN, “Human Solidarity and Ethnic Identity: Israel’s Self-definition in the Genealogical System of Genesis”, trans. R. SCHACK – M.G. BRETT, in *Ethnicity and the Bible* – ed. M.G. BRETT, Leiden, 1996, pp. 57-76.

⁹ The Vulgate reads: ‘quando dividebat Altissimus gentes quando separabat filios Adam’; and the LXX: ‘ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὑψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδὰμ’. The second part of the verse in the LXX contains the phrase ‘ἀγγέλων θεοῦ’, ‘angels of God’, for the Hebrew, ‘sons of Israel’, which in turn gives rise to the belief that each nation had its own angel. See J. M. SCOTT, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees*, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 51-52, n. 52; and BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 128-129 [n. 5]. All translations are mine except for English translations of the Bible, which are from the Revised Standard Version, unless accompanied by the Greek or Latin, in which case the translations are mine.

¹⁰ BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 127 [n. 5].

Nations comes to seventy, an important number in Ancient Israel.¹¹ The household of Jacob in Egypt consisted of seventy people (Gen. 46,27; Ex. 1,5);¹² there are said to be seventy palm trees at Elim (Ex. 15,27, Num. 33,9); and Moses appointed seventy elders at Mount Sinai (Num. 11,16-17, 24-5).¹³ Alongside the symbolic importance of the number seventy in the Table of Nations, Umberto Cassuto has interpreted other numerical patterns in the textual structure of the Table, in particular with the numbers seven, fourteen, twelve and twenty-eight: numerous progenitors are said to have seven or twelve sons,¹⁴ and certain words important for the structure of the narrative are used fourteen and twenty-eight times (both multiples

¹¹ U. CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II: From Noah to Abraham*, 1st English ed. – trans. I. ABRAHAMS, Jerusalem, 1964, rpt. 1984, pp. 175-178; and N.M. SARNA, *Genesis*, JPS Torah Commentary, Philadelphia, 1989, p. 69. For the most part, G.J. WENHAM, *Genesis 1-15*, Word Biblical Commentary 1, Nashville, TN, 1987, pp. 213-215, and B. K. WALTKE, *Genesis: A Commentary*, Grand Rapids, MI, 2001, pp. 164-165, follow CASSUTO, although both count Nimrod and discount the Philistines. J.C. VANDERKAM, “Putting them in their Place: Geography as an Evaluative Tool”, in *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*, Boston, 2002, pp. 478-480, counts seventy-three (seventy-five in the LXX) but includes Noah’s three sons and conflates the Philistines with the Casluhim. See also S. KRAUS, “Die Zahl der biblischen Völkerschaften”, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 19 (1899), pp. 1-14; *idem*, “Die Zahl der biblischen Völkerschaften”, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 20 (1900), pp. 38-43; and S. POZNAŃSKI, “Die Zahl der biblischen Völker”, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 24 (1904), pp. 301-308.

¹² The LXX here reads seventy-five (ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε and πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα); cf. Acts 7,14. See also J.W. WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, Atlanta, GA, 1993, pp. 782-783 and 786-787.

¹³ For other examples and more thorough lists of the use of the number seventy in the Ancient Middle East, see M. STEINSCHNEIDER, “Die kanonische Zahl der muhammedanischen Secten und die Symbolik der Zahl 70-73, aus jüdischen und muhammedanisch-arabischen Quellen nachgewiesen”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 4 (1850), pp. 145-170; *idem*, “Die kanonischen Zahlen 70-73, ein Nachtrag zu meinem Artikel in d. Zeitschr. Bd. 4 (1850) S. 145 ff.”, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 57 (1903), pp. 474-504; E. BURROWS, “The Number Seventy in Semitic”, *Orientalia*, n.s. 5 (1936), pp. 389-392; BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 127-128 [n. 5]; B. M. METZGER, “Seventy or Seventy-two Disciples?”, in *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian*, Grand Rapids, MI, 1968, pp. 72-74; and D. GOLDENBERG, “Scythian-Barbarian: The Permutations of a Classical Topos in Jewish and Christian Texts of Late Antiquity”, *Journal of Jewish Studies*, 49 (1998), pp. 87-102.

¹⁴ Japheth has seven sons and seven grandsons. Among the descendants of Ham, Cush has seven sons and grandsons; Mizraim (Egypt) has seven sons; Caanan has twelve sons. Among the descendants of Sem, “the sons and grandsons of Sem, up to Pelag, are twelve; the sons of Joktan are thirteen, and with Joktan fourteen—twice times seven”, CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II*, pp. 178-179 [n. 11].

of seven).¹⁵ All of these figures can also be broken down into multiples of twos, threes, fours and sevens—each of which bears significance in various ancient and medieval cultures. Cassuto further argues that because the numbers seven and twelve were thought to be numbers of perfection in the Ancient Middle East, the numerology in the Table of Nations expresses how God blessed Noah and thereby enabled him to fulfill the command to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth (Gen. 1,28, 9,1).¹⁶ With a text of such complex numerical patterning, it is therefore reasonable to infer that the absence of numerical significance among certain groups of the Table may have been done intentionally. Concurring with Cassuto, Bruce K. Waltke states, “by contrast, there are uniquely no sevens in the structuring of the Canaanite genealogy. The representation of the Canaanites in the Table of Nations stands apart by its asymmetry to match their chaos”.¹⁷

The findings of Cassuto and Waltke must nevertheless be treated with caution. For one, it should again be noted that textual issues prevent easy numeration: there are actually seventy-one names in the Hebrew version of the Table of Nations (not counting the three sons of Noah). Cassuto’s exclusion of Nimrod from the total, or the exclusion of the Philistines by Waltke among others, is not well defended and seems somewhat arbitrary, even forced. The evidence presented for significance in the number of

¹⁵ According to CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II*, p. 179 [n. 11], “the Hebrew word (*ū*)*b’nē*, ‘(and) sons of’, which is typically used in Hebrew genealogies, appears seven times in the first half of the Table (vv.1-7) and seven times in the second half (vv. 20ff). The total of the four other words ‘that are characteristic of a genealogy’: *’ābhī*, ‘the father of’, *bānīm*, ‘sons’, *tōl’dhōth*, ‘generations of’, and forms of the verb *yālādh*, ‘to bear’, come to twenty-eight in the Table”.

¹⁶ CASSUTO, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part I: From Adam to Noah*, 1st English ed. – trans. I. ABRAHAMS, Jerusalem, 1961, rpt. 1998, pp. 12-15; and *idem*, *A Commentary on the Book of Genesis. Part II*, pp. 178-180 [n. 11]. Most commentaries also agree that the Table of Nations is included in the Genesis narrative to stress that Noah was blessed and fulfilled the command to multiply and fill the earth; see VAWTER, *On Genesis*, p. 144 [n. 8]; and G. VON RAD, *Genesis*, 2nd ed. – trans. J.M. MARKS, London, 1963, p. 140; for a contrary view, see C.M. KAMINSKI, *From Noah to Israel: Realization of the Primal Blessing after the Flood*, London, 2004. There is a lengthy treatment of the number seven in Philo, *Op. mun.*, XXX.90-XLIII.128, pp. 31-44 (= Philo Alexandrinus, *De opificio mundi liber*, in *Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 1 – ed. L. COHN, Berlin, 1896); see R.A. KRAFT, “Philo’s Treatment of the Number Seven in *On creation*”, in *Exploring the Scripturesque: Jewish Texts and their Christian Contexts*, Leiden, 2009, pp. 217-236. Shorter treatments of the number ten (in relation to the number four) appear in Philo, *Op. mun.*, XV.47, p. 15, and Philo, *Plant.*, XXIX.123-125, pp. 157-158 (= Philo Alexandrinus, *De plantatione liber*, in *Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 2 – ed. L. COHN – P. Wendland, Berlin, 1897); a treatment on the numbers twelve and seventy based on biblical uses of the number appears in Philo, *Fug. Inuen.*, XXXIII.183-186, p. 150 (= Philo Alexandrinus, *De fuga et inuentione liber*, in *Opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3 – ed. P. Wendland, Berlin, 1898).

¹⁷ WALTKE, *Genesis*, p. 165 [n. 11].

repeated words seems highly coincidental, and Waltke's observation that there are no sevens used in the presentation of the Canaanite genealogy is irrelevant since Canaan is said to have twelve sons, a number whose positive significance both Cassuto and Waltke emphasize.¹⁸ It is also difficult to tell how readily the Table's original audience would have realized the complexities of such intricate numerical patterns. Although some early interpreters provide revised accounts of the Table of Nations that contain seventy names instead of seventy-one,¹⁹ early translations of the text only complicate the matter. Though the Septuagint's rendering of Genesis 10 is often said to have seventy-two names, most witnesses actually contain seventy-three (not counting the three sons of Noah);²⁰ and the Vetus Latina versions do not show consistency with either the Hebrew or the Greek.²¹ Without further study, all that can be said at the moment is that despite complications with the text and its early translations, later interpreters

¹⁸ WALTKE, *Genesis*, p. 347 [n. 11].

¹⁹ For example, Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, I.122-129, pp. 22-24 (= Flavius Iosephus, *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri I-V / libri VI-X / libri XI-XV / libri XVI-XX*, in *Opera* 1-4 – ed. B. NIESE, Berlin, 1887-1890), arrives at a total of seventy by omitting the name Dodanim of Japheth's line and including Nimrod.

²⁰ See WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, p. 127 [n. 12]. A list of manuscripts can be found in A. ENGLAND BROOKE – N. MCLEAN, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 1: *The Octateuch*, Cambridge, 1917, pp. vii-xiv, with sigla at xxviii-xxviiiib. In sum, the textual differences of the LXX Table of Nations involve the repetition, inclusion and omission of certain figures: the name Elisa is repeated twice at verses 2 and 4 (the Hebrew and Vulgate only mention Elisa at Gen. 10,4); the name Cainan is introduced at verse 22 as the son of Sem, and mentioned again as a son of Arphaxad in Gen. 10,24 and 11,12; and the name Obul (also Ebal or Gebal) is omitted at verse 28. On the basis of Cainan's appearances in the LXX, he came to enjoy a part in the apocryphal book of Jubilees (8,1-4), and more importantly in the genealogy of Christ in the Gospel of Luke (3,36). WEVERS, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*, pp. 153-154 [n. 12], convincingly argues that the figure of Cainan was introduced to the LXX text for structural unity; the addition of Cainan allows for the generations from Noah to Abraham to equal ten (thereby matching the number of generations from Adam to Noah), and for 1000 years from the son of Sem to Thara, Abraham's father, to have elapsed. One later text of the LXX, Venice, St Mark's, Gr. 4 (11th c.) includes the name Roud at verse 22, and is probably associated with the name Futh, which appears in the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* (otherwise known as *Chronicon Paschale*—a Byzantine chronicle of the seventh century), but this instance is idiosyncratic and is only mentioned here to show the potential for variance between individual manuscripts; see B. FISCHER, ed., *Genesis*, Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 2, Freiburg, 1951, p. 46, n. 22. For the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, see T. MOMMSEN, ed., *Chronica minora saec. iv. v. vi. vii.*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1892 (*MGH Auct. Antiq.*, 9), pp. 139-140.

²¹ For the most part, the LXX additions of Elisa in Gen. 10,2, and the first instance of Cainan in Gen. 10,22 are rejected in the Latin, but the second instance of Cainan in Gen. 10,24 is included in the Italic version. Unlike the LXX, the name Gebal in Gen. 10,28 is also included in the main versions of the Vetus Latina. All readings of the Vetus Latina are from FISCHER, ed., *Genesis* [n. 20].

found the total numeration of Genesis 10, which can be rounded down to seventy, more significant than the total numeration actually given in the text. However, this numeration does not seem to have been clear enough to provide convincing origins for the later symbolism behind the numbers seventy or seventy-two; instead, the number of names in Genesis 10 was later adjusted in hindsight, when authors began to recount the number of nations of the world as seventy-two in light of an already well established tradition of number symbolism.

3. *Jewish Hellenism*

A more definite beginning for the interpretation of seventy-two names in the Table of Nations starts to appear in the Hellenistic world during the third and second centuries BCE. After the death of Alexander the Great (323 BCE), the influence of Hellenistic culture began to be felt across the eastern Mediterranean world. Though some non-Hellenistic authors reacted strongly to the new prominence of Hellenism, they nevertheless argued within a discourse that clearly merged older cultural values with new Hellenistic values. Not only was Greek the prominent language for literary production, but Hellenistic science and philosophy also played a dominant role on the intellectual traditions of the Egyptians, Babylonians, and most importantly for this study, the Jews. Jewish authors were likely exposed to the prominence of the number seventy-two as an important astrological number among Greek, Roman, Egyptian and Babylonian thought. It is often repeated that the heavens were divided into seventy-two parts, or that there were seventy-two stars that are able to influence the world. Moreover, among some ancient Greek authors, the number seventy was rhetorically used to enumerate the particular cities or nations of a region, and to represent a totality of a particular group of people.²²

It is not until the second century BCE that the *Letter of Aristeas*, a Hellenistic Jewish text, offered the first unambiguous reference to the number seventy-two that would later play an important role in the late antique usages of the number. According to the *Letter*, King Ptolemy II Philadelphus (282-246 BCE) commissioned the High Priest Eleazar to send six Hebrew scholars from each of the twelve tribes of Israel (making a total

²² For a wide range of examples, see BURROWS, "The Number Seventy in Semitic", pp. 389-390 [n.13]; SCOTT, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 51-54 [n. 9]; and A. DREIZEHNTER, *Die rhetorische Zahl: Quellenkritische Untersuchungen anhand der Zahlen 70 und 700*, Munich, 1978 (*Zetemata* 73), pp. 20-69 and 93-102, but see also the review of DREIZEHNTER by J. BRISCOE, *The Classical Review* 30 (1980), pp. 80-82.

of seventy-two) to translate the Pentateuch into Greek, which they accomplished in seventy-two days:

Βουλομένων δ' ἡμῶν καὶ τούτοις χαρίζεσθαι καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς μετέπειτα, προηγήμεθα τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν μεθερμηνευθῆναι γραμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἐκ τῶν παρ' ὑμῶν λεγομένων Ἑβραϊκῶν γραμμάτων [...] Καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις [...] ἐπιλεξάμενος ἄνδρας καλῶς βεβιωκότας πρεσβυτέρους, ἐμπειρίαν ἔχοντας τοῦ νόμου, καὶ δυνατοὺς ἐρμηνεῦσαι, ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ.

And since we want to show favour to these men [former Jewish captives] and to all the Jews throughout the world and to those hereafter, we have proposed to translate your law from the Hebrew letters of your language into Greek letters [...] Therefore, you will do well to choose elders, who live justly, who have proficiency in the law, and who are able to translate—choose six from each tribe.²³

The phrase “ἀφ' ἑκάστης φυλῆς ἕξ”, “six from each tribe”, rhetorically underlines the numerical importance of the *Letter* by means of alliteration as well as its disjunct position at the end of the clause. Elsewhere in the *Letter*, the number seventy-two is stressed three times,²⁴ and becomes a major aspect behind the suggestion that the translation was accomplished through divine action.

Modern scholarship does not accept the *Letter's* account of the translation of the Septuagint as historically valid, but rather considers it to be a piece of propaganda, perhaps for Greek proselytization, of a Hellenized Jew who, in the guise of a Greek pagan, wanted to stress the favour that Judaism found in the Alexandrian court.²⁵ In fact, only one third of the letter, which is divided into 322 sections and runs to about seventy pages in the modern edition, deals with the actual translators and translation; the other two-thirds set out descriptions and digressions that all cast the

²³ *Aris. ep.*, §§ 38-39, pp. 124-126 (= *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* – ed. A. PELLETIER, Paris, 1962 [SC 89]); parallel lines are found in §§ 32 and 46, pp. 120-122 and 128-130. It is usually assumed, based on the *Letter of Aristeas*, that the term *septuaginta* is simply a shorter form of *septuaginta (et) duo*; but for the complexity of the issue, see S. JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, Oxford, 1968, p. 57; and H.M. ORLINSKY, “The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text”, in *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, vol. 2: *The Hellenistic Age* – ed. W.D. DAVIES – L. FINKELSTEIN, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 537-540.

²⁴ *Aris. ep.*, §§ 50, 273 and 307, pp. 130, 220 and 232 [n. 23]; the number seventy is found at §§ 33 and 84, pp. 122 and 142.

²⁵ A. WASSERSTEIN – D.J. WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint From Classical Antiquity to Today*, Cambridge, 2006, pp. 22-25; but for the argument that the letter was written only for Jews and not as propaganda for converting the Greeks, see V. TCHERIKOVER, “The Ideology of the Letter of Aristeas”, *Harvard Theological Review*, 51 (1958), pp. 59-85.

Jewish people and their Law in a positive light.²⁶ In terms of the number seventy-two, as Hermann J. Weigand states, “[i]t can hardly be doubted that legend selected this number of translators in order to support the conception that the law originally given to the Jews only was to become the rule of life for all races of men”.²⁷ While the number seventy-two in the *Letter of Aristeas* might have attained some symbolic value in its association with the use of the number seventy (or seventy-two) in the Old Testament and perhaps even in the Table of Nations, it probably attained more value in its association with the numbers six and twelve, which the *Letter* specifically mentions as the parts that make up the number seventy-two. As a piece of Hellenistic propaganda, the *Letter's* reference to the numbers six and twelve cleverly syncretizes numerology important to both Hellenistic and Jewish cultures, and insinuates that sophistication found among Jewish thinkers was comparable to the sophistication of the Greeks. According to Greek mathematical theory, the number six was the first perfect number (τέλειος ἀριθμός) because “it is both the sum and product of its own parts: it is formed either by adding 1 + 2 + 3 or by multiplying 1 x 2 x 3”.²⁸ Philo of Alexandria (20 BCE-c. 45 CE), one of the fathers of the allegorical approach to scriptural interpretation,²⁹ reveals a good example of the Hellenistic syncretism of Jewish philosophy during the turn of the millennium. In his *De opificio mundi*, Philo connects the mathematical significance of the number six allegorically to the six days of creation (a move that would be followed by the early Church Fathers):

τάξει δὲ ἀριθμὸς οἰκεῖον, ἀριθμῶν δὲ φύσεως νόμοις, γεννητικώτατος ὁ ἕξ· τῶν τε γὰρ ἀπὸ μονάδος πρῶτος τέλειός ἐστιν, ἰσούμενος τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσι καὶ συμπληρούμενος ἕξ αὐτῶν, ἡμίσεος μὲν τριάδος, τρίτου δὲ дуάδος, ἑκτου δὲ μονάδος, καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν ἄρρην τε καὶ θῆλυς εἶναι πέφυκε καὶ τῆς ἑκατέρου δυνάμεως ἡρμοσται· ἄρρην μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς οὖσι τὸ περιττόν, τό δ' ἄρτιον θῆλυ· περιττῶν μὲν οὖν ἀριθμῶν ἀρχὴ τριάς,

²⁶ WASSERSTEIN – WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, p. 24 [n. 25], give a brief description of the contents not concerned with the translation; these include descriptions of the liberation of the Jews, gifts to the High Priest, Jerusalem and Palestine, priestly service in the Temple, the Jewish law, and honours bestowed upon the translators by the king.

²⁷ WEIGAND, “The Two and Seventy Languages of the World,” pp. 249-250 [n. 5]. See also BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 143 [n. 5].

²⁸ SCHIMMEL, *The Mystery of Numbers*, p. 122 [n. 4]. See also HOPPER, *Medieval Number Symbolism*, pp. 36-37 [n. 3]; and BUTLER, *Number Symbolism*, p. 8 [n. 3]. The *locus classicus* for the perfect number is Euclid, *Elem.*, IX. 36, p. 227 (= Euclid, *Elementa: libri I-IV / libri V-IX / liber X / libri XI-XIII / libri XIV-XV et scholia in libros I-V* – ed. I.L. HEIBERG – E.S. STAMATIS, 5 vols., Leipzig, 1969-1977): “τέλειος δὲ ἀριθμός ἐστιν ὁ τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μέρεσιν ἴσος ὢν”, “the perfect number is the one that is equal to its parts”.

²⁹ For Philo's allegorical methods for interpreting the Old Testament, see B. SMALLEY, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, 3rd ed., Notre Dame, IN, 1978, pp. 2-8.

δυὰς δ' ἀρτίων, ἡ δ' ἀμφοῖν δύναμις ἐξάς. ἔδει γὰρ τὸν κόσμον, τελειότατον μὲν ὄντα τῶν γεγονότων, κατ' ἀριθμὸν τέλειον παγῆναι τὸν ἕξ.

Number is fitting to order, and the number six, most of all numbers, by the laws of nature, pertains to producing; for it is the first perfect number from the number one that is equal to its own parts and is constituted of them: its half is three and its third is two, and its sixth is one; and, so to say, it is by nature both male and female, and is arranged from the quantity of each. For in the things that exist, the odd is male and the even is female; therefore, while the number three is the beginning of odd numbers, the number two is the beginning of all even numbers, and the quantity of both is six. For it was necessary that the world, which is the most perfect of all things produced, be established according to the perfect number, six.³⁰

Secondly, the number twelve had significance in Greek astrology and mythology as the number of the signs of the zodiac, months in a year, the Olympians, and the labors of Hercules among others.³¹ The number twelve also appears in ancient Jewish literature: there are twelve sons of Jacob who form the twelve tribes of Israel (Gen. 35,22-26, 49,28), twelve springs of water at Elim (Ex. 15,27, Num. 33,9, along with seventy palm trees), and twelve minor prophetic books.³² As stated above, there may be numerological elements involving the number twelve in the Table of Nations, which according to Waltke, “seems to represent God’s ordering of creation and history”.³³

Furthermore, although the number seventy played a more important symbolic role in Jewish numerology than the number seventy-two, the importance of the number seventy-two did seem to increase, especially as Jewish scholars began to question the traditional number of elders at Sinai during the second century BCE. Some Jewish authors found that the number of elders mentioned in Exodus 24,14 added up to seventy-two on account of Moses’ statement: “behold, Aaron and Hur are with you”.³⁴ It is

³⁰ Philo, *Op. mun.*, III.13, p. 4 [n. 16]. For discussion, see BUTLER, *Number Symbolism*, 22-23 [n. 3]. A similar exposition on the number six is also found in Philo, *Leg. all.*, I.ii.3-4, p. 62 (= Philo Alexandrinus, *Legum allegoria libri I-III*, in *Opera quae supersunt* – ed. L. COHN, vol. 1, Berlin, 1896). See also Aug., *Ciu.*, XI.xxx, p. 350 [n. 2].

³¹ See SCHIMMEL, *The Mystery of Numbers*, pp. 192-193 [n. 4].

³² SCHIMMEL, *The Mystery of Numbers*, p. 193 [n. 4].

³³ WALTKE, *Genesis*, p. 347 [n. 11].

³⁴ JELlicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, pp. 57-58 [n. 23]. See also STEINSCHNEIDER, “Die kanonische Zahl der muhammedanischen Secten”, *passim* [n. 13]; and BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 189-90 [n. 5]. In a similar manner, the Irish-Augustine, *De mirabilibus sacrae scripturae libri tres*, PL 35, col. 2161, adds two names from Num. 11,26 to the seventy elders in order to come to the figure seventy-two: “Moysi spiritus in septuaginta seniores distribuitur: et aliis duobus qui in castris resederant, Heldad videlicet et Medad, ejus spiritus

therefore possible that the author of the *Letter* legitimately used the number seventy-two as a symbolic number that echoed the elders at Sinai, and consequently the wisdom of Judaism, again in order present a syncretism of Greek and Jewish knowledge. Though the use of the number seventy-two in the *Letter of Aristeas* does not yet compare to the extent of typological usage among some late antique and medieval Christians, it does reveal a very complex approach to Jewish and Hellenistic numerology that presents the symbolic value of the number much more formally and explicitly than does the Table of Nations.

Interestingly, however, the number seventy-two and its possible association with divine influence in the translation of the Septuagint, as well as the revised number of elders at Sinai, did not have a strong following in Hellenistic Jewish sources after the *Letter of Aristeas*, despite the fact that the *Letter* enjoyed wide circulation throughout Antiquity.³⁵ Josephus, for example, who includes the *Letter* with some abridgement in his *Libri antiquitatum Iudaicarum*, copies the parts of the *Letter* that state that there were six translators from each tribe, but renders the number of translators as only seventy.³⁶ While it is possible that Josephus “carelessly forgets that there were 6 from each tribe”,³⁷ it is more likely, as Harry M. Orlinsky argues, that the numerological tradition of seventy was stronger at this point than seventy-two and Josephus simply used a number of more symbolic significance for him and his intended audience.³⁸ On the contrary, Josephus does not hesitate to associate the number seventy-two with certain other motifs: for example, the seventy kings mentioned in Judges 1,7 and the seventy-seven lambs of Ezra 8,35 both become seventy-two.³⁹ Sim-

prophetiae donum condonatur”, “the spirit of Moses is distributed among seventy elders, and the gift of the spirit of prophecy was granted to another two who stayed in the camp—Eldad and Medad”.

³⁵ The *Letter* now survives in more than twenty manuscripts dating from the eleventh to sixteenth centuries in *catena in Ochateuchum*, “chains” of quotations attached to certain verses of the Octateuch; see PELLETIER, ed., *Lettre d'Aristée*, pp. 8-9 [n. 23]. Furthermore, much of it is quoted verbatim by Jewish and Christian authors; see WASSERSTEIN – WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, chs. 1-2 and 5 [n. 25].

³⁶ Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, XII.57, p. 82 [n. 19]; R. MARCUS, ed., *The Jewish Antiquities*, vol. 7: *Books XII-XIV*, Cambridge, MA, 1934, p. 31, states that some scribes correct the figure to seventy-two, but he does not list the manuscripts that provide the variant. NIESE also does not list variants in the app. crit. For the Latin translation, see Josephus, *The Latin Josephus*, vol. 1 – ed. F. BLATT, Aarhus, 1958; because BLATT's edition only encompasses Books I-V, and as the second volume does not seem forthcoming, it is impossible to check the Latin variants.

³⁷ MARCUS, ed., *The Jewish Antiquities*, p. 31, note b [n.37].

³⁸ ORLINSKY, “The Septuagint and its Hebrew Text”, p. 539 [n. 23].

³⁹ Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, V.123, p. 317, and XI.137, p. 31 [n. 19]. See BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 171 [n. 5] for other minor examples.

ilarly, Philo expands the origins of the legend as it is found in the *Letter* and solidifies the notion that the translation of the Septuagint was a divine and miraculous act, on par with Old Testament prophecy, but he does not use the number seventy-two—a surprising omission for one so imbued in Greek mathematical theory.⁴⁰ It is possible that Philo, like Josephus, did not find the number seventy-two to have the same significance placed on it by the *Letter of Aristeas*, and was therefore reluctant to mention it.⁴¹

As the accounts of Josephus and Philo reveal, the numerical significance behind the number seventy-two was not as well established as the numerical significance behind the number seventy in Judaic literature.⁴² Likewise, among the early Christian authors, the putative number of translators of the Septuagint varied between seventy and seventy-two. On the one hand, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Eusebius, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Rufinus, and Jerome among others mention that there were only seventy translators of the Septuagint. On the other hand, those who state that the number of translators was seventy-two are far fewer: Tertullian, who is also the first Christian author to mention the *Letter of Aristeas* by name, Epiphanius, Philastrius, and Augustine all declare that there were seventy-two translators.⁴³ The name that was in popular usage by Late Antiquity, *Septuaginta* (not *Septuaginta duo*), probably played a role in the reduction of the number. Augustine, for example, while recognizing that there were seventy-two translators, states, “quorum interpretatio ut Septuaginta uocetur, iam obtinuit consuetudo”, “their translation, which is called the Septuagint, has now prevailed as the custom[ary translation]”.⁴⁴ It is evident that the use of the number seventy-two in the *Letter of Aristeas* never gained much importance as such, and in most cases the tradition regarding seventy-two translators did not prevail against the more significant numerology of seventy.

⁴⁰ Philo, *Vita Mos.*, II.v.25-vii.44, pp. 206-210 (= Philo Alexandrinus, *De vita Mosis libri I-II*, in *Opera quae supersunt* – ed. L. COHN, vol. 4, Berlin, 1902).

⁴¹ For Philo’s dependence on the *Letter of Aristeas*, see JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, p. 39 [n. 23].

⁴² WASSERSTEIN – WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, p. 53 [n. 25], give more examples of later Judaic writings where the number of translators is not established.

⁴³ See the *Testimonia* in P. WENDLAND, ed., *Aristeae ad Philocratem epistula cum ceteris de origine uersionis LXX interpretum testimoniis*, Leipzig, 1900, pp. 87-166; and WASSERSTEIN – WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, pp. 95-131 [n. 25], for references.

⁴⁴ Aug., *Ciu.*, XVIII.xlii.21-22, p. 638 [n. 2].

4. *The New Testament and Early Christian Writings*

After the account of the number of translators of the Septuagint first provided by the *Letter of Aristeas*, the number seventy-two appears in the New Testament, an appearance which certainly increased the number's symbolic significance and contributed to the beginning of its later typology. In some early manuscripts of Luke 10,1, including most of the *Vetus Latina* translations and the Vulgate,⁴⁵ Jesus sends seventy-two disciples ahead of him to preach.⁴⁶ This numeration of disciples, despite its opaque origins, breathed new life into the cultural value of the number seventy-two among Christians in a manner that was lacking in the numeration of the *Letter of Aristeas*. But the manuscript witness of Luke 10 is not unambiguous, and this ambiguity, along with that of the number of Septuagint translators, reveals that the significance of the number seventy-two was very much in transition during the first century CE. According to the careful studies of Bruce M. Metzger and more recently of Joseph Verheyden, the evidence for the priority of either seventy or seventy-two in Luke 10,1 is of equal weight, creating an incertitude reflected in the vacillation of modern translations and commentaries.⁴⁷ With the inconclusive evidence of the textual traditions and other early witnesses aside, it is the symbolic significance of either number that becomes the strongest factor for determining priority. Whereas a number of scholars claim that Luke is drawing on prevalent Jewish numerology, such as the number of elders in the Sanhedrin or the number of palm trees at Elim,⁴⁸ Sidney Jellicoe argues that the value of the number seventy-two of the *Letter of Aristeas* had not been completely abandoned at this point in time. An educated Gentile author such as Luke, who relies more on the Septuagint than any other Gospel writer and would have almost certainly been familiar with the *Letter of Aristeas*, might have used the number seventy-two as a direct allusion to the *Letter*

⁴⁵ A. JÜLICHER, ed., *Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung*, vol. 3: *Lucasevangelium*, Berlin, 1976, p. 116.

⁴⁶ “ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα <δύο>, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο <δύο>”, “the Lord appointed seventy [seventy-two] others, and sent them out two by two”, *Novum testamentum graece*, 27th rev. ed. – ed. E. NESTLE et al., Stuttgart, 1998.

⁴⁷ METZGER, “Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?” [n. 13]; and J. VERHEYDEN, “How Many Were Sent According to Lk 10,1?”, in *Luke and His Readers. Festschrift A. Denaux* – ed. R. BIERINGER – G. VAN BELLE – J. VERHEYDEN, Leuven, 2005 (*Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, 182), pp. 193-238. For a convenient arrangement of the major manuscripts, see R.J. SWANSON, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Various Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: Luke*, Sheffield, 1995, p. 182.

⁴⁸ See HOPPER, *Medieval Number Symbolism*, pp. 70-71 [n. 3]; and BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 222-223 [n. 5]. VERHEYDEN, “How Many Were Sent According to Lk 10,1?”, pp. 215-223 [n. 47], provides an excellent summary of the scholarly opinions.

of *Aristeas*. This suggestion gains some further currency when the similar aims of Jewish and Gentile syncretism in the Gospel of Luke and the *Letter of Aristeas* are considered.⁴⁹ If Jellicoe is correct in his assumption, the cultural value of the number seventy-two, which seems to begin in earnest with the *Letter of Aristeas*, is strengthened by a latent allusion to the *Letter* in some of the early manuscript traditions of the Gospel of Luke. On the contrary, there is little explicit evidence for this assumption and it has not gained widespread acceptance. Others have suggested that the number seventy or seventy-two in Luke 10 may have been used for its symbolic value in association with the Hebrew or Septuagint reckonings of the names of the Table of Nations.⁵⁰ Although this suggestion is especially alluring in light of later Christian and medieval interpretations that make this very connection,⁵¹ the problem is that there is no strong evidence that the clear association between the numbers seventy or seventy-two and the Table of Nations had been formed by this time.⁵² Although James M. Scott does list an impressive array of authors who rhetorically use the number seventy or seventy-two that may allude to the totality of the world's ethnic, political or linguistic groups,⁵³ none of his examples are connected concretely to the Table of Nations or are earlier than Luke. Undoubtedly, direct references to the number of nations in the world as seventy and seventy-two appear in Jewish and Christian literature after Luke was written, and it is very possible that Luke's allusion to the number was meant to be understood as such. There is, unfortunately, again a lack of evidence for any firm conclusion for this period.⁵⁴ Verheyden, who takes a similar approach, argues that Luke's use of the number seventy reflects a widespread Roman and

⁴⁹ S. JELlicoe, "St Luke and the 'Seventy(-two)'" , *New Testament Studies*, 6 (1960), pp. 319-321; *idem*, "St. Luke and the Letter of Aristeas", *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 80 (1961), pp. 149-155; and *idem*, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, p. 45 [n. 23].

⁵⁰ M.C. PARSONS, "The Place of Jerusalem on the Lukan Landscape: An Exercise in Symbolic Cartography", in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* – ed. R.P. THOMPSON – T.E. PHILLIPS, Macon, GA, 1998, pp. 155-171, at p. 163; and SCOTT, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 51-56 [n. 9].

⁵¹ For example, many Anglo-Saxon exegetes were fond of connecting the disciples to the number of nations in the world; see SAUER, "Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt" [n. 5]; *idem*, "Die 72 Völker und Sprachen der Welt: Einige Ergänzungen" [n. 5]; and T. MAJOR, "Rebuilding the Tower of Babel: Ælfric and Bible Translation", *Florilegium*, 23 (2006), pp. 47-60, at pp. 53-54.

⁵² BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 223 [n. 5].

⁵³ SCOTT, *Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity*, pp. 51-55 [n. 9].

⁵⁴ The fact that no author before Irenaeus actually mentions the number of nations in the world as seventy or seventy-two, despite other number symbolism involving seventy or seventy-two (e.g. the number of people who went into Egypt as mentioned in Gen. 46,27 or Jubilees 44,33-34), may indicate that this use of the numbers seventy or seventy-two developed sometime after Luke.

Greek rhetorical tendency to apply the number to “a group of persons [...] formed with a specific purpose”, though unlike Scott, Verheyden does not attempt to interpret Luke 10,1 as an allusion to Genesis 10.⁵⁵

To confuse the issue further, the presence of the number seventy or seventy-two in Luke 10 did not have an immediate impact on early Christian authors, some of whom made use of the number seventy-two with no apparent reference to Luke 10 or the number of the translators of the Septuagint. Irenaeus of Lyon (c. 130-c. 200), for example, is the first Christian author after Luke to find the number seventy-two significant.⁵⁶ Importantly, he is also the first person to connect this number to the number of nations and languages of the world and to do so typologically. In the third book of his *Adversus haereses*, which survives in its entirety through a literal Latin translation of the original Greek, Irenaeus, making reference to the genealogy of Christ in the Gospel of Luke (3,23-38), writes:

Propter hoc Lucas genealogiam quae est a generatione Domini nostri usque ad Adam LXXII generationes habere ostendit, finem coniungens initio et significans quoniam ipse est qui omnes gentes exinde ab Adam dispersas et uniuersas linguas et generationes hominum cum ipso Adam in semetipso recapitulatus est.

On account of this [theology of recapitulation] Luke shows that the genealogy that goes from the generation of the Lord even to Adam has seventy-two generations; he connects the end to the beginning and signifies that the Lord himself is the one who has ‘recapitulated’ all nations from Adam thereafter [including] all the dispersed languages and generations of humans with that same Adam.⁵⁷

Despite Irenaeus’ claim regarding the number of names in Luke 3, there actually exists no manuscript or other witness of the Greek New Testament that contains exactly seventy-two names in this genealogy (the standard number is seventy-seven). While it is possible that Irenaeus was using a now lost manuscript that contained a genealogy of only seventy-two names,⁵⁸ or that he simply miscounted, it is probable that he interpreted the genealogy through the notion that the total number of “all the dispersed languages and generations of humans” came to seventy-two. It is unclear, however, which of his sources, besides his dubious count of the

⁵⁵ VERHEYDEN, “How Many Were Sent According to Lk 10,1?”, pp. 230-237, quotation at p. 234 [n. 47].

⁵⁶ BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 230 [n. 5].

⁵⁷ Iren., XXII.3.43-49, p. 438 (= Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses liber III*, in *Contre les Hérésies Livre III: Édition critique* – ed. A. ROUSSEAU – L. DOUTRELEAU, Paris, 1974 [SC 211]).

⁵⁸ The manuscript N, St. Petersburg, Ross. Nac. Bibl., Gr. 537, contains seventy-three names; see SWANSON, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts*, p. 47 [n. 47].

names of the genealogy in Luke, had directly acquainted him with this notion, or any notion involving the number seventy-two. When Irenaeus speaks of the number of translators of the Septuagint, he claims that there were only seventy,⁵⁹ and the version of Luke 10 that he uses has Jesus sending out only seventy disciples.⁶⁰ Because the phrase “dispersas et uniuersas linguas et generationes hominum” must allude to the dispersal of languages and nations at the Tower of Babel, Irenaeus evidently associated the number seventy-two with the Table of Nations. But unless he miscounted here or was using an irregular version, the Table of Nations of the Septuagint provides seventy-three names. It is likely that Irenaeus was drawing on the tradition, particularly popular among Greek authors, that connected angels to nations based on the Septuagint’s version of Deuteronomy 32,8 (see note 9 above). Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Eusebius all state that angels were assigned over nations. However, not one of these early authors gives any specific number to the angels or the nations; only in the later pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones* is it stated that there were seventy-two nations and angels.⁶¹

Two other analogues remain for Irenaeus’ statement, which although they are too late to be considered sources, at least show that there was a developing tradition that associated a fixed number to the nations of the world. The first is the Talmud, Jewish commentary on certain scriptural books, which was orally transmitted during Irenaeus’ life, and later written down during the fifth century. The second is the developing genre of the Christian chronicle. Although the written versions of the Talmud, and the Christian chronicles that survive were recorded after Irenaeus and probably could not have had much influence on him directly, it is likely that Irenaeus, the Talmud, and the chronicles (and perhaps even Luke) were all drawing on the same tendencies to begin to look at the Table of Nations as a scriptural basis for the number of nations of the world.⁶² While the Jewish sources favoured the number seventy because of its traditional

⁵⁹ Iren., XXI.2.29-30, p. 402 [n. 57]: “perfectiores Scripturarum intellectores et utriusque loquellae LXX seniores”, “seventy elders who were very accomplished in [the study of] the Scriptures and who also knew both languages”.

⁶⁰ Iren., XIII.2.32-34, p. 254 [n. 57]: “Quomodo autem septuaginta praedicabant, nisi ipsi prius ueritatem praedicationis cognouissent?”, “and how did the seventy [disciples] preach, unless they themselves had known beforehand the truth of what they were preaching”.

⁶¹ For references, see BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 232-233 (Clement), I, 233 (ps.-Clement), I, 236 (Origen), and I, 241-241 (Eusebius) [n. 5].

⁶² A refined approach to the argument that the Book of Jubilees is the source for later discussions on the Table of Nations can be found in J.M. SCOTT, “The Division of the Earth in *Jubilees* 8:11-9:15 and Early Christian Chronography”, in *Studies in the Book of Jubilees* – ed. M. ALBANI – J. FREY – A. LANGE, Tübingen, 1997, pp. 295-323.

symbolic value (and because it is also possible that the Hebrew author(s) of Genesis 10 meant to express the symbolic number of seventy),⁶³ the Christian sources may have favoured the number seventy-two because of its precedence in the *Letter of Aristeas*, in Greek astrology, mathematics and mythology, in the dissenting Jewish notion of seventy-two elders, in the Gospel of Luke or, most likely, on account of all or most of these factors together. The obscure and vague notions of the symbolic significance of the number seventy-two most likely allowed early Christian authors to employ the number for its symbolic value and typological potential but, at the same time, did not allow for any one text to claim a beginning to the phenomenon with any certainty before the end of Late Antiquity. Naturally, the biblical texts of Genesis 10 and Luke 10 were later interpreted by early medieval authors to bestow, almost unequivocally, authority to the symbolism and typology of the number seventy-two in a way that the *Letter of Aristeas* or Jewish tradition could not.

Alongside Irenaeus, these early Christian chronicles deserve further examination, especially as they provide prominent examples for the connection of the number of names in the Table of Nations to the growing, but still vague, tradition of the seventy-two nations of the world. The first Christian chronological compilation,⁶⁴ the *Chronographiae* of Julius Africanus, now only survives in quotations from other authors of Late Antiquity; but these quotations, which often interact with the text of Julius, reveal much information on the textual criticism behind counting the names of the Table of Nations. While there does not exist a list of nations (or *Völkertafel*) in the fragments of Julius, other authors note certain discrepancies between him and their own received biblical text. For example, Georgius Syncellus (9th c.) quotes a short list derived by Julius from Genesis 10:

Μετὰ δὲ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν Σὴμ ἐγέννησε τὸν Ἀρφαξᾶδ.
 Ἀρφαξᾶδ δὲ γενόμενος ἑτῶν ρλε' γεννᾷ τὸν Σαλᾶ, Ἰβηρ.
 Σαλᾶ γενόμενος ἑτῶν ρλ' γεννᾷ τὸν Ἑβερ, Ἰβηρ.
 Ἑβερ γενόμενος ἑτῶν ρλδ' γεννᾷ τὸν Φαλέκ, Ἰβηρ.

⁶³ For the Talmudic sources that connect the number seventy with the number seventy-two, see METZGER, "Seventy or Seventy-Two Disciples?", p. 72 [n. 13].

⁶⁴ B. CROKE, "The Originality of Eusebius' Chronicle", *The American Journal of Philology*, 103 (1982), pp. 195-200, argues that Julius Africanus' five volume work was not considered a "chronicle" by the Church of Late Antiquity, and that Eusebius is to be credited as the first Christian chronicler. See also the recent discussion regarding the so-called Leipzig World Chronicle; D. COLOMO et al., "Die älteste Weltchronik. Europa, die Sintflut und das Lamm"; A. Weiß, "Die Leipziger Weltchronik – die älteste christliche Weltchronik?"; and R.W. Burgess, "Another Look at the Newly-Discovered 'Leipzig World Chronicle'", *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete*, 56 (2010), pp. 1-25, 26-37; and 58 (2012), pp. 16-25.

And after the Flood, Sem begot Arphaxad. Arphaxad, at the age of 135, begot Sala in 2397. Sala, at the age of 130, begot Eber in 2527. Eber, at the age of 134, begot Phalek in 2661.⁶⁵

Unlike the main textual tradition of the Septuagint, Julius omits the second instance of the name Cainan, the son of Arphaxad and father of Sala—an omission that was followed by Eusebius.⁶⁶ But other chronographers, such as Georgius Syncellus, as well as the authors of the *Anonymus Matritensis* and the *Chronicon Epitomon*,⁶⁷ all take issue with the absence of this second Cainan, an absence which agrees with the Hebrew version, but which they reject because of the presence of Cainan in Luke's genealogy (Lk. 3,36).⁶⁸ Whatever was the original count of the names in Julius' *Chronographiae* (if there even existed a full list), the discrepancies between Julius and his later readers reveal the textual instability of the Septuagint version at this time and hinder the simplistic theory that the number seventy-two is based on an universal count of the names in the Table of Nations. At the same time, these discrepancies also disclose an important issue on the presence of Cainan in the Septuagint which will continue to be an issue of contention as late as the Anglo-Saxon period when Bede renews the debate in one of his own chronological tracts.⁶⁹

After Julius Africanus, the first extant chronicle is found in the works of Hippolytus (c. 170-c. 236). Borst places much emphasis on the role Hippolytus played on the opinions of multiculturalism and multilingualism in the early Church, with sweeping statements such as, "Hippolyts prägnante Formeln hatten eine glänzende Zukunft vor sich", and "mit Hippolyt beginnt, wenn man so will, das Mittelalter avant la lettre".⁷⁰ Although the *Liber generationis*, a fifth-century Latin chronicle based on Hippoly-

⁶⁵ Iul. Afr., *Chron.*, F16c, p. 28 (= Iulius Africanus, *Chronographiae: The Extant Fragments* – ed. M. WALLRAFF, Berlin, 2007 [GCS n.f., 15]).

⁶⁶ Eus. *Chron.* pp. 41-42 (= Eusebius Caesariensis, *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt mit textkritischem Kommentar* – ed. J. KARST, *Eusebius Werke* 5, Berlin, 1911 [GCS, 20]). See WALLRAFF, ed., *Chronographiae*, p. 28, n. 2-12 [n. 65].

⁶⁷ The *Anonymus Matritensis* is a tenth-century chronicle, likely written in Constantinople, but named after its existence in a Madrid manuscript; and the *Chronicon Epitomon* is a Greek chronicle extant in two manuscripts in Vienna, dating to the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. See WALLRAFF, ed., *Chronographiae*, pp. l and lxix.

⁶⁸ Iul. Afr., *Chron.*, T16i-o, pp. 36-40 [n. 65].

⁶⁹ See Bed., *Temp.*, XVIII.1-2, p. 602 (= Beda uenerabilis, *De temporibus liber* – ed. C.W. JONES, Turnhout, 1977 [CC SL, 123C]); Bed., *Luc.*, I.2796-2807, p. 90 (= Beda uenerabilis, *In Lucae evangelium expositio* – ed. D. HURST, Turnhout, 1960 [CC SL, 120]); and Bed., *Ex. Act.*, Pref.35-41, p. 4 (= Beda uenerabilis, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, in *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum et retractatio* – ed. M.L.W. LAISTNER, Turnhout, 1983 [CC SL, 121]).

⁷⁰ BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 370, 373 [n. 5].

tus' Greek text, was widely read in the Middle Ages,⁷¹ Borst's own views towards Hippolytus' direct influence on the Christian tradition may be exaggerated, especially in light of recent scholarship on the figure. Neither Eusebius nor Jerome knew much about this early Christian commentator: Jerome, following the same source as Eusebius,⁷² states that, Hippolytus was a bishop, "nomen quippe urbis scire non potui", "indeed the name of [whose] city I have not been able to learn".⁷³ And while many modern scholars, following Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger, have understood Hippolytus to be a Roman ecclesiastic of the third century who refused to acknowledge the authority of Popes Callistus, Urban and Pontian, and even set himself up as an anti-pope,⁷⁴ J.A. Cerrato has recently cast much doubt on the history of the so-called Hippolytus Romanus.⁷⁵ Although the cult of Hippolytus enjoyed a large reputation in Europe during the Middle Ages, his writings, which survive in Greek, along with some Syriac translations, were largely ignored after his death.⁷⁶

Despite the relative ignorance of his works among later readers, Hippolytus, or at least the author of the chronicle ascribed to Hippolytus, admittedly does reveal an important step in the development of the tradition of the number seventy-two. For Hippolytus is one of the first Christian authors to provide a list of the descendants of Noah side by side with lists of contemporary nations, regions and languages of the world. In the *Dia-merismos*, a section of the chronicle that deals with the diversity of the world in light of the three sons of Noah, Hippolytus states that Japheth had fifteen sons, Ham thirty and Sem twenty-five to make a total of seventy descendants.⁷⁷ Hippolytus overcomes the problems of the number in the biblical Table of Nations by using names that are not found in the

⁷¹ A.-D. V. DEN BRINCKEN, *Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising*, Düsseldorf, 1957, p. 55.

⁷² J.A. CERRATO, *Hippolytus between East and West: The Commentaries and the Provenance of the Corpus*, Oxford, 2002, pp. 38 and 43; the putative common source is the lost *Apology for Origen* of Pamphilus.

⁷³ Hier. *Vir. Inlust.*, XLI, p. 35 (= S. Hieronymus presbyter, *Liber de uiris inlustribus* – ed. E.C. RICHARDSON, Leipzig, 1896 [*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 14.1]). For the mention of a Hippolytus in Eusebius' *Historia*, see CERRATO, *Hippolytus between East and West*, pp. 26-44 [n. 72].

⁷⁴ J.J. IGNAZ VON DÖLLINGER, *Hippolytus and Callistus, or The Church of Rome in the First Half of the Third Century*, trans. A. PLUMMER, Edinburgh, 1876.

⁷⁵ CERRATO, *Hippolytus between East and West*, *passim* [n. 72].

⁷⁶ *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Hippolytus", p. 652.

⁷⁷ Hip. *Chron.*, §§ 56-73, pp. 11-13 (Japheth's fifteen sons); §§ 92-130, pp. 17-20 (Ham's thirty sons); §§ 158-188, pp. 24-28 (Sem's twenty-five sons) (= Hippolytus, *Die Chronik* – ed. A. BAUER – R. HELM, *Hippolytus Werke* 4, Berlin, 1955 [GCS, 46]). See BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 370-371 [n. 5].

Hebrew or Septuagint versions of Genesis 10, and omitting names that are. In one instance, Hippolytus states that two of the descendants make up one nation: “Ὡς καὶ Οὐλ, ὅθεν γεννῶνται Λυδοί”, “Hos and Oul, from whom arose the Lydoi”.⁷⁸ The number seventy was evidently important for Hippolytus and he was willing to adjust the biblical account in order to attain it. In another section, however, he states that there are seventy-two languages in the world that arose from the seventy-two nations that divided at Babel.⁷⁹ This discrepancy, which also appears in the Latin *Liber generationis* and cannot be completely explained by the unstable textual transmission of chronicle writing,⁸⁰ reveals a merging of the Jewish and Christian traditions: the number seventy, which has more symbolic significance in Jewish thought, is united, albeit awkwardly, with the number seventy-two, which had already begun to gain similar significance among Christian authors such as Luke and Irenaeus. Unlike Irenaeus, however, Hippolytus does not use the number as the basis for typology.

But despite the lack of any explicit typology, Hippolytus provides an important precedent for later authors by disconnecting the number of the descendants of Noah from the number of nations that have arisen in the world. Essentially, Hippolytus has updated the Table of Nations with his own knowledge of contemporary ethnicity: Japheth's fifteen sons give rise to forty-seven nations (ἑθνη), Ham's thirty sons to thirty-two nations, and Sem's twenty-five to only sixteen nations.⁸¹ And after Hippolytus, the *Liber generationis* further updates Hippolytus' list by adding three more nations (*gentes*) to Japheth's lineage and two more to Sem's.⁸² Once Hippolytus has established this disconnect between the descendants of Noah and the nations of the world, it is not difficult for him to separate the number of descendants from the number of languages in the world. Some of the languages are clearly connected with a tribe; the language of the Ἑβραῖοι, “Hebrews”, is connected to the name Ἑβρα, “Eber”, for example. But the languages of other peoples, such as Ταῖννοι, “Tainenoi”, have no precedent in the Table of Nations or in a contemporary nation.⁸³ As Anna-Dorothee v. den Brincken states, “Zwar gibt es zu allen Zeiten kritische Denker, die

⁷⁸ Hip., *Chron.*, § 167, p. 26 [n. 77].

⁷⁹ Hip. *Chron.*, §§ 98-201, pp. 17-33 [n. 77]. See BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 932-936 [n. 5], who provides a convenient edition of the seventy-two languages listed in Hippolytus' chronicle.

⁸⁰ *Lib. gen.*, § 197, p. 107 (= *Liber generationis*, in *Chronica minora saec. iv. v. vi. vii*, vol. 1 – ed. T. MOMMSEN, Berlin, 1892 [*MGH Auct. Antiq.*, 9]).

⁸¹ Hip. *Chron.*, §§ 79-80, 131-132 and 189-190, pp. 14, 20-21 and 28-29 [n. 77].

⁸² *Lib. gen.*, §§ 83 and 190, pp. 97-98 and 106 [n. 80].

⁸³ Hip. *Chron.*, §§ 172 and 200, pp. 26-27 and 31-33 [n. 77]. BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 933, no. 9 [n. 5], connects the Ταῖννοι to an “Araberstamm”.

jedoch in dem zu behandelnden Zeitraum gewöhnlich Furcht haben, als Neuerer angesehen zu werden, und daher vor allem das Ziel verfolgen, ihre Neuerkenntnisse nach Möglichkeit mit der Überlieferung in Einklang zu bringen”.⁸⁴ In this case, Hippolytus must accept the tradition that he has inherited (his *Überlieferung*), but also must revise it according to his new knowledge (*Neuerkenntnisse*). He thereby provides the next step that later readers and writers will need to harmonize with their own knowledge of the world. While the number of languages in the world was thought to remain static at seventy-two throughout Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages, similar notions regarding the number of nations of the world were not as common—nations could rise and fall, multiply or diminish and in each case alter the total number. Seventy-two (or, in these earlier accounts, seventy) was merely the number of the nations that were originally dispersed at Babel. But now that seventy-two was beginning to be established and standardized as the total number of original nations and languages of the world, its typological potential also began to show, especially for creating a connection between the world’s nations and the Christian mission to convert the nations.

5. *Christian Authors Before and Including Augustine*

Whereas the usage of the number seventy-two among fourth-century Greek and Latin authors continues to reveal its importance for Christian exegesis and theology, the inconsistency and diversity of this usage indicate the emergence of new creative applications of the number as well as a general lack of interpretive uniformity. The number’s strong symbolic value that prevailed in the previous centuries begins to show signs of nascent typological value among those writing after Irenaeus and the chronicle attributed to Hippolytus; but it is not until after Augustine firmly standardized the number of names in Genesis 10 at seventy-two that the typology involving the number flourishes among Latin authors of the sixth century. Before Augustine, the number was used in typical as well as idiosyncratic manners. On the one hand, Epiphanius of Salamis (c. 315-403), the last Greek author to employ the number with such frequency, asserts that there are seventy-two nations and languages of the world, seventy-two translators of the Septuagint according to the *Letter of Aristeas*—he is even accredited for expanding the legend to include the thirty-six cells—and seventy-two

⁸⁴ A.-D. V. DEN BRINCKEN, “Die lateinische Weltchronistik”, in *Mensch und Weltgeschichte: Zur Geschichte der Universalgeschichtsschreibung* – ed. A. RANDA, Salzburg, 1969, pp. 43-86, at p. 44.

apocryphal books.⁸⁵ But despite this usage of the number in Epiphanius' works, there is little connection between the disparate elements, typological or otherwise.⁸⁶ On the other hand, some of Epiphanius' Latin contemporaries reveal that neither the symbolic nor the typological significance of the number seventy-two was universally accepted. Philastrius (d. c. 397), in his *Diuersarum hereseon liber*, makes use of the number seventy-two when writing about the number of translators of the Septuagint, the number of singers for each of David's four choirmasters (1 Chron. 25,7), and the number of David's psalms.⁸⁷ But Philastrius also expresses the unusual view that there are seventy-five languages of the world: "nomina prouinciarum diuisa sunt, ueluti septuaginta quinque linguarum", "the names of the regions were divided just as the seventy-five languages".⁸⁸ Although there is biblical precedent in the Septuagint for a possible numerological connection with

⁸⁵ Epi., *Anc.*, 112-114, pp. 136-142 (= Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, in *Epiphanius: Ancoratus und Panarion*, vol. 1 – ed. K. HOLL, Leipzig, 1915 [GCS, 25]); *idem*, *De mensuris et ponderibus liber*, PG 43, col. 241; and *idem*, *Men. Syr.*, pp. 18 and 20 (= *Epiphanius' Treatise on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version* – ed. and trans. J.E. DEAN, Chicago, 1935). See WASSERSTEIN – WASSERSTEIN, *The Legend of the Septuagint*, pp. 116-124 [n. 25]; and JELICOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, p. 45 [n. 23], who notes that Epiphanius' claim that the act of translating the Septuagint was done by seventy-two scholars, who worked in pairs, is probably to be associated with the phrase, "two by two", in Luke 10,1, and thereby recollects the seventy-two disciples.

⁸⁶ Other examples among Greek authors are catalogued by BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 227-257 [n. 5]: the ps.-Clementine *Recognitiones* states that there are seventy-two nations and angels (I, 233); Nilus of Ancyra states there are seventy children of Jacob in Egypt, nations and languages (I, 251); Cyril of Alexandria states that there are seventy disciples of Christ (I, 253); Theodoret of Cyrus states that there are seventy-two nations and languages and connects the number to the 288 musicians of David mentioned in 1 Chron. 25,7 (I, 254); and Eusebius of Emesa states there are seventy angels, sons of Noah and children of Jacob (I, 256); moreover, Ephrem the Syrian gives an account of the seventy-two descendants of Noah (I, 259). To supplement BORST's survey, one can add the reference to seventy-two colours in the *Gospel of Philip*, 63.25-30, noted by VERHEYDEN, "How Many Were Sent According to Lk 10,1?", p. 203, n. 39 [n. 47], and discussed by P. NAGEL, "Der Kessel des Levi: EvPhil NHCCod. II,3: P. 63,25-30", in *Der Christliche Orient und seine Umwelt* – ed. S. G. VASHALOMIDZE – L. GREISINGER, Wiesbaden, 2007, pp. 215-225, as well as a connection between David's 288 musicians and the seventy-two descendants of Noah that can be found in Eus. *Comm. Ps.*, pp. 73 and 76 (= Eusebius Caesariensis, *Commentaria in Psalmos*, PG 23), which provides the likely source to Theodoret's reference.

⁸⁷ Phil., *Diu. her.*, CXLII.5.28-29, pp. 306-307 *et passim* (= Filastrius Brixiensis, *Diuersarum hereseon liber* – ed. F. HEYLEN, Turnhout, 1957 [CC SL, 9]): "LXX duorum interpretatio", "the translation of the seventy-two"; CXXIX.5.27-31: "Zelo enim diuino ductus beatus David [...] quattor choros posuit secundum mundi aditus ana <i.d. ὀνά> septuaginta duo", "For blessed David, who was led by a divine zeal [...] placed four choirmasters, according to the entrances of the world, to seventy-two [singers]"; CXXX.4.13-14, p. 294: "septuaginta duos psalmos", "seventy-two psalms". See also Eus., *Comm. Ps.*, pp. 73 and 76 [n. 86].

⁸⁸ Phil., *Diu. her.*, CXII.1.7-8, p. 278 [n. 87].

the seventy-five people who went down into Egypt (Gen. 46,27; Ex. 1,5; cf. Acts 7,14), Philastrius clearly shows how he derives his number from his count of the sons of Noah: “Et de primo [filio, Sem] quidem uiginti quinque generationes numerat descendisse, de secundo triginta quinque id est Cham. De Iapheth autem, cui minor generatio numerabatur tunc temporis, id est quintadecima”, “And from the first [son, Sem], it is numbered that indeed twenty-five generations had descended; from the second son, that is Ham, thirty-five. But from Japheth, whose generation at the time was number the smallest, there were fifteen”.⁸⁹ The view that there are seventy-five languages also has a precedent outside the Bible. In his *Stromata*, Clement of Alexandria mentions a certain Ephoros who (erroneously) held such an opinion.⁹⁰ It is unlikely, however, that this Ephoros had any influence on Philastrius.

Even more idiosyncratic than Philastrius' view is that of Pacian of Barcelona (4th c.) who makes no mention of either seventy or seventy-two languages in the world, but on account of the 120 disciples mentioned in Acts 1,15, states that there are 120 languages of the world: “lingua est secundum copiam Domini, qui eam in centum viginti ora modulatus est”, “language is according to the abundance of the Lord, who has orchestrated it in 120 mouths”.⁹¹ Although Pacian appears briefly in Jerome's *De uiris inlustribus*,⁹² he does not seem to have enjoyed a wide readership after the fourth century, and his idiosyncratic view on the number of languages in the world did not prevail. What this example from Pacian does reveal, however, is an early, though never exactly commonplace, penchant among some Latin Christian authors to connect the languages of the world with the apostolic mission that begins with Pentecost, even though Acts 2, which narrates the linguistic miracle of Pentecost, gives no mention of the number of disciples or languages present that day in Jerusalem.

Even Jerome himself, one of the *doctores ecclesiae* whose works would be widely read throughout the Middle Ages, expresses an unusual phrase that strays from the standard numerological tradition. In his commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, Jerome expounds upon a pericope from Mat-

⁸⁹ Phil., *Diu. her.*, CXXI.4-5.22-25, p. 285 [n. 87].

⁹⁰ Clem., *Str.*, I.xxi.142.1, p. 88 (= Clemens Alexandrinus, *Stromata: Buch I-VI* – ed. O. STÄHLIN, *Clemens Alexandrinus* 2, Leipzig, 1960 [GCS, 15]): “Εφορος δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν ἱστορικῶν καὶ ἔθνη καὶ γλώσσας πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα λέγουσιν εἶναι, ἐπακούσαντες τῆς φωνῆς Μωυσέως [LXX Gen. 46:27 is then quoted]”, “Ephoros and many other historians state that there are seventy-five nations and languages, following the word of Moses”. See also BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 232 [n. 5].

⁹¹ Pacian, *Epistola II. de Symproniani litteris*, PL 13, col. 1060A; for the reference to Acts, see BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 380-381 [n. 5].

⁹² Hier., *Vir. inlust.*, CVI, p. 49 [n. 73].

thew 26,53: “An putas quia non possum rogare Patrem meum, ut exhibeat mihi modo plus quam duodecim legiones angelorum”, “do you not think that I can ask my father to reveal for me now more than twelve legions of angels”. He calculates that, because a legion consists of 6000 soldiers, Jesus here could have had 72000 angels (12 x 6000) sent to protect him. The following comment, however, Borst finds so striking that he “wünscht sich die Augen”.⁹³ Jerome continues: “Pro breuitate temporis numerum non occurrimus explicare; typum tantum dixisse sufficiat septuaginta duo milia angelorum (*in quot gentes hominum lingua diuisa est*) duodecim legionibus fieri”, “for brevity’s sake, we do not hasten to explain this number, [but] let it only be sufficient to have spoken of this figure: the 72000 angels (*in just as many nations of humans, was language divided*) are made up of twelve legions”.⁹⁴ It is unlikely that Jerome actually believed that there are 72000 languages in the world, which greatly surpasses even modern estimates that place the figure around 7000.⁹⁵ In all likelihood, Jerome is making reference only to the first two digits of the number 72000, through which he can evoke a *typus* that he seems to assume his readers would have been familiar with.

Elsewhere, Jerome makes another small but important contribution to the development of the later typology of the number seventy-two. In his *Epistula* 64, he states that according to the requirements of the priestly garments described in Exodus 28, each robe held seventy-two bells hemmed onto the lowest fringe: “in extrema uero parte [sc. uestimentorum], id est ad pedes, septuaginta duo sunt tintinabula et totidem mala Punica”, “in the lowest part [of the garments], that is at the feet, there are seventy-two bells and just as many pomegranates”.⁹⁶ The reasons for Jerome’s association between the number seventy-two and the priestly bells, which has an unclear origin in Exodus 28,33,⁹⁷ are vague, and he seems to be borrowing in part from Josephus, his primary source for the description of the priestly robe. But while Josephus states that the six names of Joseph’s sons are writ-

⁹³ BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 390 [n. 5].

⁹⁴ Hier., *Matt.*, IV.1346-1350, p. 258 (= S. Hieronymus presbyter, *Commentariorum in Matheum Libri IV* – ed. D. HURST – M. ADRIAEN, Turnhout, 1969 [CC SL, 77]. Emphasis mine.

⁹⁵ The *Ethnologue* website, which is run by SIL International (formerly, the Summer Institute of Linguistics) places the number of language of the world at 7,413 (up from 6912 in 2009), <http://www.ethnologue.com>, accessed 4 February 2013.

⁹⁶ Hier., *Ep.*, LXIV.14.2, p. 600 (= S. Hieronymus presbyter, *Epistulae I-LXX / LXXI-CXX* – ed. I. HILBERG, 2 vols, Vienna, 1996 [CSEL, 54-55]).

⁹⁷ Ex. 28,33: “deorsum uero ad pedes eiusdem tunicae per circuitum quasi mala punica facies ex hyacintho et purpura et cocco bis tincto mixtis in medio tintinabulis”, “and down at the feet of the same tunic around the hem, you will make, as it were, pomegranates of blue and purple and twice dyed scarlet with bells inserted in between”.

ten on the twelve stones of Aaron's breastplate, which would total seventy-two names,⁹⁸ and claims that there were seventy pomegranates alongside the "little bowls" of the temple candelabrum,⁹⁹ he does not explicitly mention that there were seventy-two bells and pomegranates.¹⁰⁰ Alternatively, in the Babylonian Talmud, the use of seventy-two bells and pomegranates on the priestly robe is mentioned,¹⁰¹ and although the written Talmud is too late to be a source for Jerome, it is possible, especially considering his residence in Bethlehem, that Jerome used oral Jewish tradition regarding the seventy-two pomegranates alongside his readings of Josephus. In any case, Jerome's *Epistula* 64 provides a major source for medieval commentators, most notably Isidore and Bede, who later use the numerical information that Jerome provides for their own typological purposes.¹⁰²

Although the use of the number seventy-two in connection to the languages and nations of the world was prevalent enough for Jerome to be able to connect it without much comment to the 72000 angels of a legion, it was not until Jerome's younger contemporary, Augustine of Hippo (354-430), that the number seventy-two became solidified within late antique

⁹⁸ Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, III.166, p. 191 [n. 19]. See also MEYER, *Die Zahlenallegorese*, p. 168 [n. 3], and V. IZMIRLIEVA, *All the Names of the Lord: Lists, Mysticism, and Magic*, Chicago, 2008, pp. 94-95, who shows this tradition also to be present in the Kabbalistic text, *Book of Bahir*.

⁹⁹ Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, III.145, p. 187 [n. 19].

¹⁰⁰ Ios., *Ant. Iud.*, III.160, p. 190 [n. 19]: "κατὰ πέζαν δ' αὐτῶν προσετραμμένοι θύσανοι ῥοῶν τρόπον ἐκ βαφῆς μεμιμημένοι ἀπὴρτηντο καὶ κώδωνες χρύσειοι κατὰ πολλὴν ἐπιτήδευσιν τῆς εὐπρεπείας, ὥστε μέσον ἀπολαμβάνεσθαι δυοῖν τε κωδώνων ῥοῖσκον, καὶ ῥοῶν κωδώνιον"; Josephus, *The Latin Josephus*, p. 238: "ornatusque in fimbriis eius inest velut malagranatorum et tintinabulorum aureorum multo decore factorum, ita ut inter duo tintinabula malum granatum habeatur. item tintinabulum inter duo malagranata", "the attire on its fringes is as if of pomegranates and golden bells made with much beauty, such that there is a pomegranate between two bells, and a bell between two pomegranates".

¹⁰¹ Zeb., 88b (= Zebahim, in *The Babylonian Talmud*, part 6, vol. 1: *Seder Kodashim* – ed. I. EPSTEIN – trans. H. FREEDMAN, London, 1948): "Seventy two bells containing seventy two clappers were brought and hung thereon [sc. the robe], thirty six on each side". See Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, I, 194; IV, 2062 [n. 5].

¹⁰² See Is., *Ety.*, XIX.xxi.4 (= Isidorus Hispalensis, *Etymologiarum siue originum libri XX*, 2 vols. – ed. W.M. LINDSAY, Oxford, 1911); Hrabanus Maurus, *De universo libri viginti duo*, PL 111, col. 568C; and Bed., *Tab.*, III.737-772, pp. 111-112 (= Beda uenerabilis, *De Tabernaculo* – ed. D. HURST, Turnhout, 1969 [CC SL, 119A]). An interesting idiosyncrasy appears in Quod., *Prom.*, II.iii.43-47, p. 73 (= Quoduultdeus Carthaginensis, *Liber promissionum et praedictorum Dei* – ed. R. BRAUN, Turnhout, 1976 [CC SL, 60]), who gives the unusual figure of fifty bells, and then connects them typologically to the languages spoken at Pentecost: "In quinquaginta uero tintinnabulis totidemque malis granatis linguae sunt ecclesiarum quae per spiritum sanctum die pentecosten in specie ignis diuisae discipulis insederunt, ut etiam numerus ipse ostendit", "In the fifty bells and just as many pomegranates are the languages of the churches which became divided into the disciples through the Holy Spirit in the image of fire on the day of Pentecost, just as the number itself reveals".

and medieval thought to the extent that it was rarely questioned as the number of nations and languages that were dispersed at Babel and as the number of Christ's disciples. In his *De ciuitate Dei*, Augustine devotes several pages (in the CC SL edition) tackling the number seventy-two and its connection to the Table of Nations. Like the Christian chroniclers before him, Augustine provides an enumeration of the names in the Septuagint version of Genesis 10, which according to his text has seventy-three names. In this aspect, Augustine is the first to examine seriously the inconsistency between the text and the growing tradition. In book sixteen of *De ciuitate Dei*, a book that treats the world's ethnic and linguistic diversity, Augustine states: "Vnde colligitur septuaginta tres uel potius (quod postea demonstrabitur) septuaginta duas gentes tunc fuisse", "therefore it is calculated that there were then seventy-three, or rather (which will be demonstrated afterwards) seventy-two nations".¹⁰³ As he hints, Augustine is unsatisfied with the actual number seventy-three probably because of its divergence from the growing tradition of the number seventy-two, and he therefore attempts to reconcile the difference.

For his tally of the names in the Table of Nations, Augustine essentially argues that the father and son, Eber and Pelag, count as only one nation. His evidence is that because Pelag was born at the time the languages of the world were divided (Gen. 10,25), it is not necessary that he spoke a language that differed from that of his father, Eber, who as the name indicates, spoke Hebrew. In fact, because Pelag is an ancestor of Abraham, who spoke Hebrew, it must be that both Eber and Pelag spoke the same language and only count as one in the reckoning of the seventy-three names. Pelag is mentioned in the Table of Nations not to indicate another nation, different from his father Eber, but to indicate that during his lifetime the languages were confused:

Phalech autem propterea commemoratus est, non quod gentem fecerit (nam eadem ipsa est eius gens Hebraea eademque lingua), sed propter tempus insigne, quod in diebus eius terra diuisa sit.

But Pelag was mentioned for this reason: not that he made a nation (for his is the very same Hebrew nation and language), but because of the notable time that the earth was divided in his days.¹⁰⁴

On account of the effort that Augustine expends to syncretize the seventy-three names of the Table of Nations and to argue that there are sev-

¹⁰³ Aug., *Ciu.*, XVI.iii.89-90, p. 503 [n. 2].

¹⁰⁴ Aug., *Ciu.*, XVI.xi.67-71, p. 514 [n. 2]. See WEIGAND, "The Two and Seventy Languages of the World" pp. 252-254 [n. 5], for the chronological problems in the Vulgate for Augustine's argument.

enty-two original nations and languages, it is clear that by the fifth century the number seventy-two had gained much significance for biblical interpretation. Augustine firmly believes that the tradition of the seventy-two names and the Septuagint count of names are both true, albeit in variance with one another, and he uses his utmost ingenuity to reconcile the two. With Augustine's vast influence on later authors, his discussion of the number seventy-two provides an important step towards standardizing seventy-two as the number of nations that dispersed at Babel and consequently the number of languages of the world that would provide the basis for future typological interpretations.

Of equal significance is Augustine's opinion that the Table of Nations only represents the original founders of the world's nations, not the current state of the world's ethnic division. Just as in Hippolytus' *Diamerismos* and the *Liber generationis*, the nations of the world far exceeded their original number, but languages, on the other hand, remain static at seventy-two. In *De ciuitate Dei*, Augustine observes that there are more nations than there are languages and provides evidence from his own experience of African nations: "Auctus est autem numerus gentium multo amplius quam linguarum. Nam et in Africa barbaras gentes in una lingua plurimas nouimus", "the number of nations has increased more than the number of languages. For in Africa we know that many barbarian nations speak in one language."¹⁰⁵ For this reason, Augustine later emphasizes division of the world by language instead of ethnicity: "Quid enim aliud intellegendum est terram esse diuisam nisi diuersitate linguarum?", "for how otherwise should it be understood that the earth was divided unless by the diversity of languages".¹⁰⁶ Serving as a bishop in Hippo Regius (in modern-day Algeria), Augustine could not deny that there are more African nations than are presented in the Table of Nations, and he must interpret the biblical Table of Nations accordingly. In his interpretation, he sets out to harmonize a traditional text with his own knowledge of the world, and this harmonization must have lent much support to the numerological tradition, which continues to develop in the following centuries.

Interestingly, Augustine himself did not capitalize much on the typological potential of the number seventy-two. For example, in his *Quaestiones euangeliorum*, he connects the seventy-two disciples typologically to the hours in a three day cycle: "Sicut uiginti quattuor horis totus orbis peragitur atque lustratur, ita ministerium inlustrandi orbis per euangelium trinitatis in septuaginta duobus discipulis intimatur", "just as the entire globe is travelled around and illuminated [by the sun] in twenty-four hours, so the

¹⁰⁵ Aug., *Ciu.*, XVI.vi.48-50, p. 507 [n. 2].

¹⁰⁶ Aug., *Ciu.*, XVI.x.12-13, p. 511 [n. 2].

ministry of illuminating the globe is imitated in the seventy-two disciples through the gospel of the Trinity".¹⁰⁷ Considering Augustine's discussion of the number seventy-two elsewhere, it is striking that he makes no mention of the seventy-two nations or languages of the world in this instance, especially since such a point would have played well into his idea of the *totus orbis*. Evidently, the typological significance of the number seventy-two has not yet reached its height. But by providing the longest and most detail discussion on the number of names in the Table of Nations since its inception, Augustine deserves credit for fostering, more than any other author, the foundations that subsequent late antique and medieval exegetes would build upon for their own typological employment of the number seventy-two.

6. *Christian Authors After Augustine*

Although the number seventy-two was interpreted as the standard number of descendants of Noah's sons after Augustine's influential treatment in *De ciuitate Dei*, opinions on the number of descendants from each son would never become uniform. Among the authors of a generation after Augustine, Arnobius the Younger (late 5th c.), who had some influence at least on Bede,¹⁰⁸ mentions that there arose seventy-two languages after the Tower of Babel, but offers highly irregular numbers for the number of descendants:

Noe tres filios habuit, Sem, Cham, Iafeth. Sem primogenito pars facta est [...] quae spatia terrarum habent linguas sermone barbarico uiginti et septem [...] Cham uero secundus filius Noe [...] habens linguas sermone [...] numero uiginti duabus linguis [...] Iafeth autem habet [...] in linguis uiginti tribus. Fiunt ergo omnes simul linguae septuaginta duae

Noah had three sons: Sem, Ham and Japheth. A part [of the world's inhabited places] was made by the firstborn, Sem [...] these places of lands have twenty-seven languages in barbaric speech. And the second son of Noah, Ham, had twenty-two languages in number. Yet Japheth has [lands that speak] in twenty-three languages. Therefore all together there are seventy-two languages.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ Aug., *Qu. eu.*, II.xiv.2-4, p. 58 (= S. Aurelius Augustinus, *Quaestiones evangeliorum* – ed. A. MUTZENBECHER, Turnhout, 1980 [CC SL, 44B]). Bede also discusses the seventy-two hour period in *Luc.*, III.1872-1896, pp. 213-214 [n. 69]; *Temp. rat.*, V.13-18, pp. 283-284 (= Beda uenerabilis, *De temporum ratione liber* – ed. C.W. JONES, Turnhout, 1977 [CC SL, 123B]); and *Tab.*, III.763-772, p. 112 [n. 102].

¹⁰⁸ Bede., *Temp. rat.*, LXVI.26.185-186, p. 468 [n. 107]: "Cuius diuisionis Arnobius rethor in expositione psalmi CIIII ita meminit", "Arnobius the Rhetorician so mentions this division in his exposition of Psalm 104".

¹⁰⁹ Arn., *Comm. Ps.*, CIV.60-76, p. 159 (= Arnobius Iunior, *Commentarii in Psalmos* – ed. K.-D. DAUR, Turnhout, 1990 [CC SL, 25]). See BORST, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, II, 416-418 [n. 5].

While Arnobius' figures do add up to the number seventy-two, he is in accordance with neither the biblical enumeration nor his predecessors, as is shown below.

The Descendants of Noah from the Hebrew Table of Nations to Isidore

Author	Japheth	Ham	Sem	Total
Hebrew Bible	14	31	26	71
Vulgate	14	30	27	71
LXX	15	31	27	73
Josephus	14	31	26	70
Hippolytus' <i>Diamerismos</i>	15	30	25	70
Philastrus	15	35	25	75
Epiphanius	15	32	25	72
Augustine	15	31	27 / 26	73 / 72
Arnobius	23	22	27	72
Isidore <i>Ety</i>	15	31	27	73 / 72
Isidore <i>Chr</i>	15	30	27	72

Clearly, there was little agreement over the number of descendants of each son, but Arnobius' reckonings remain the most atypical. Only his tally of the descendants of Sem conforms to the number of the Septuagint and Augustine; Arnobius' tallies of Japheth and Ham are unique compared to all other authors. What is even more astonishing here is that Arnobius does not follow his sources—the chronological tradition represented by the Latin *Liber generationis*, the Greek *Diamerismos* or the chronicle of Epiphanius¹¹⁰—in his enumeration of the languages of the descendants of Noah. The line following the above-cited quotation, however, does provide a clue: “patriae autem generationum mille, quae in tripertito saeculo hoc ordine sitae sunt”, “yet homelands of the generations come to a thousand, which have been situated in a threefold world in this order”.¹¹¹ Like Hip-

¹¹⁰ The geographic distribution of the sons of Noah is described almost verbatim in Hip., *Chron.*, §§ 46-50, p. 10 [n. 77]; Epi., *Anc.*, 112.3-4, pp. 136-137 [n. 85]; and *Lib. gen.*, §§ 49-52, p. 95 [n. 80]. See also J. PIILONEN, *Hippolytus Romanus, Epiphanius Cypriensis and Anastasius Sinaita: A Study of the ΔΙΑΜΕΡΙΣΜΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ*, Helsinki, 1974 (Suomalaisen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicae, B.181), pp. 31-36; and A. VON GUTSCHMID, “Untersuchungen über den Διαμερισμός τῆς γῆς und andere Bearbeitungen der Mosaischen Völkertafel”, in *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 5 – ed. F. RÜHL, Leipzig, 1894, pp. 585-717, at pp. 619-621.

¹¹¹ Arn., *Comm. Ps.*, CIV.77-78, pp. 159-160 [n. 109].

polytus and Augustine before him, Arnobius does not equate *gentes* and *linguae*, but rather disconnects them in two ways: first, ambiguous terminology, such as *patriae* and *generationes* instead of *gentes* or *nationes*,¹¹² is used effectively to focus the division of Noah's descendants not on ethnic but rather geographic and linguistic distinctions. Secondly, the number seventy-two is used to contrast the number of the world's languages with the equally symbolic thousand geographical units that are inhabited by Noah's descendants. Arnobius realizes that any interpretation of the Table of Nations that equates nation with language is too strict, since he knows that numerous nations may all speak one language. For example, he describes various Latin speaking *patriae*: "cum una lingua Latina sit, sub una lingua diuersae sunt patriae Bruttiorum, Lucanorum, Apulorum, Calabrorum, Picentum, Tuscorum et his atque huiuscemodi patriis similia", "although there is one Latin language, under one language are dispersed the homelands of the Bruttii, Lucani, Apuli, Calabrians, Picentes, Tuscans and there are [other] similarities to these and to the other homelands of the sort".¹¹³ Like his predecessors, Arnobius is working within the framework given by the Table of Nations and the chronicle tradition, but he modifies his sources to accord with his own geographical and linguistic understandings, which were more diverse than the original biblical framework had provided. Especially after the authority bestowed on it by Augustine, the number seventy-two was almost always evoked as a necessary structure for categorizing the world, but the elements within this structure were not limited by the same authority, and the freedom to diverge from a source was often gladly accepted by authors such as Arnobius.

Unlike Arnobius, whose account of the world's ethnic and linguistic diversity was relatively inconsequential, Isidore of Seville (c. 560-636) enjoyed an enormous influence on later thinkers. In his well-known work, the *Etymologiae*, Isidore follows Augustine almost verbatim by writing:

Gentes autem a quibus divisa est terra, quindecim sunt de Iaphet, triginta et una de Cham, viginti et septem de Sem, quae fiunt septuaginta tres, vel potius, ut ratio declarat, septuaginta duae; totidemque linguae, quae per terras esse coeperunt, quaeque crescendo provincias et insulas inpleverunt.

And the nations by which the earth was divided: there are fifteen from Japhet, thirty-one from Ham, and twenty-seven from Sem, which total seventy-three, or rather, as reason demonstrates, seventy-two; and just as many languages,

¹¹² The Vulgate does not use the word *patriae* in Gen. 10-11, but it does use the word *generationes* (10,1, 10,20, 11,10) albeit with different nuances than Arnobius. The commonest words of ethnic division in Gen. 10-11 are *familiae*, *gentes* and *nationes*.

¹¹³ Arn., *Comm. Ps.*, CIV.65-68, p. 159 [n. 109].

which began to exist throughout the earth, each filled provinces and islands by increasing.¹¹⁴

In this passage, Isidore affirms Augustine's numeration of the sons of Noah by stating that while there are seventy-three names mentioned in the Table of Nations, the number of original nations and languages is actually seventy-two. But, unlike Augustine, Isidore does not give the *ratio* for this change. In fact, in his *Chronica*, Isidore ignores the differentiation between seventy-three and seventy-two by simply stating that there were seventy-two sons: "Fuerunt autem Noe filii tres, ex quibus septuaginta duae gentes sunt ortae: id est XV de Iafeth, XXX de Cham, XXVII de Sem", "and there were the three sons of Noah, from whom arose the seventy-two nations, that is fifteen from Japheth, thirty from Ham, twenty-seven from Sem".¹¹⁵ Surprisingly, this numeration differs from the logical conclusion of Augustine's *ratio*. Both Augustine and Isidore want the descendants of Noah to come to seventy-two in the final count; one name, therefore, needs to be removed from the Septuagint's total of seventy-three. According to Augustine, Sem's two sons Heber and Pelag only count as one; this amalgamation brings the number of Sem's descendants to twenty-six and the total number to seventy-two. But without explanation, Isidore subtracts one of Ham's thirty-one descendants instead of Sem's in order to preserve the total of seventy-two. Evidently, Isidore is careful enough to follow Augustine's lead to have the sum of Noah's descendants equal seventy-two, but he does not take into consideration how Augustine's tally of the individual parts should logically occur. Neither Isidore nor his audience was much concerned with the individual figures of the descendants of Noah as long as the total of seventy-two was retained. Isidore's account, thereby, provides a perfect example of the standardization of the number seventy-two for the number of Noah's descendants that is lacking standardization in its parts.

Moreover, Isidore is one of the first to make the significant association between the number seventy-two and the number of books in the Bible. While attempts at "closing" the official canon of the Bible began in the fourth century, there was and still is no universal agreement regarding the contents of sacred Scripture.¹¹⁶ Early lists of canonical books almost never agree exactly in number and content, and there is no emphasis placed on

¹¹⁴ Is., *Ety.*, IX.ii.2 [n. 102]; the Augustinian source is *Ciu.*, XVI.vi.45-48, p. 507 [n. 2].

¹¹⁵ Is., *Chron.*, para. 18, p. 20 (= Isidorus Hispalensis, *Chronica* – ed. J.C. MARTIN, Turnhout, 2003 [CC SL, 112]). The same numeration appears in Isidore, *Quaestiones in Vetus Testamentum*, PL 83, col. 237B.

¹¹⁶ See B.M. METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*, Oxford, 1987, pp. 209-247, and 267-288.

the significance of the number.¹¹⁷ But most likely because there was numerical significance placed on the number of books of the Old Testament by Jewish authors,¹¹⁸ and because some early Christian lists came close to totalling seventy-two, by the seventh century, it was no great step for Isidore to bring the number of canonical books to seventy-two.

Before Isidore, various writers hint at the later formation of a tradition of seventy-two canonical books. 4 Esdras 14,46-47 cryptically mentions seventy books that contain a “sapientiae fons et scientiae flumen”, “fount of wisdom and river of knowledge”. And in the Syriac version of Epiphanius’ *De mensuris et ponderibus* it is stated that there are seventy-two apocryphal books.¹¹⁹ More importantly, Augustine provides a list of seventy-one biblical books in his *De doctrina Christiana*, forty-four from the Old Testament and Apocrypha and twenty-seven from the New Testament.¹²⁰ Despite its significance for him elsewhere, Augustine apparently did not associate the number seventy-two with the number of biblical books, even though he could have easily reached the number by separating the book of Lamentations from Jeremiah, which was commonly done.¹²¹ Alongside Augustine, the Council of Hippo (393) and the Third Council of Carthage (397), both of which were African dioceses that Augustine had much influence

¹¹⁷ For these early lists, see METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament*, pp. 191-207 *et passim* [n. 116].

¹¹⁸ According to Jewish and early Christian traditions, the number of books in the Old Testament totaled either twenty-two, which was the same number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, or twenty-seven, which included the second pronunciations of the five so-called *begadkephath* letters. See Ios. *Ap.*, I,37-41, pp. 8-9 (= Flavius Iosephus, *De Iudaeorum vestustate sive contra Apionem libri II* – ed. B. NIESE, *Flavii Iosephi opera*, vol. 5, Berlin, 1889), and Hier., *Prol.*, p. 364 (= S. Hieronymus presbyter, *Prologus in libro regum*, in *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, 4th ed. – ed. R. WEBER Stuttgart, 1994): “Viginti et duas esse litteras apud Hebraeis [...] ita viginti duo volumina supputantur”, “There are twenty-two letters according to the Hebrews [...] thus there are reckoned to be twenty-two books”. For the *begadkephath* letters, of which there are actually six, see W. GESENIUS, *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar, as Edited and Enlarged by the Late E. Kautzsch*, 2nd English ed., trans. A.E. COWLEY, Oxford, 1910, § 6n, pp. 33-34.

¹¹⁹ Epi., *Men. Syr.*, p. 26 [n. 85]; see JELlicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, p. 45, n. 7 [n. 23].

¹²⁰ Aug., *Doct. chr.*, II.viii.13.21-57, pp. 39-40 (= S. Aurelius Augustinus, *De doctrina christiana libri IV* – ed. J. MARTIN, Turnhout, 1962 [CC SL, 32]). The same reckoning of canonical books appears in the Council of Carthage (397), for which, see A.-M. LA BONNARDIÈRE, “Le Canon des divines Ecritures”, in *Saint Augustin et la Bible* – ed. A.-M. LA BONNARDIÈRE, Bible de tous les temps 3, Paris, 1986, pp. 289-301.

¹²¹ For example, Hier., *Prol.*, p. 365 [n. 118], states that some people count *Cinoth* (i.e. Lamentations), among others, as a separate book for a total of twenty-five.

over, decreed that there were seventy-one canonical books; and even in the sixth century, the pseudo-Gelasian Decree lists only seventy-one books.¹²²

Likewise, Cassiodorus (c. 485-585), in his *Institutiones*, lists three *divisiones* of sacred Scripture, one according to Jerome, another to Augustine and a third to the Septuagint.¹²³ Each division is different, and Cassiodorus plays upon the numerical symbolism of each total. In his division according to Augustine, Cassiodorus lists seventy-one books. But because the number seventy-one is not associated with any typological or allegorical significance, Cassiodorus simply tells the reader to add the *sanctae Trinitatis unitas*, assumedly to make a total of seventy-two, which is “totius librae competens et gloriosa perfectio”, “in agreement with, and glorious perfection of, the whole pound”.¹²⁴ This same reckoning would be found later in the famous Codex Amiatinus, a biblical manuscript created in eighth-century Northumbria, whose exemplar, the Codex Grandior, was overseen by Cassiodorus himself.¹²⁵ What is surprising with Cassiodorus and the Codex Amiatinus is the absence of the typological connections to the number of Christ’s disciples or the languages of the world—both of which were prominent at the time. Only the *libra*, which alludes to the division a pound of gold into seventy-two pieces in Antiquity,¹²⁶ is mentioned.

On the contrary, although Isidore follows Augustine in his reckoning of seventy-one books of the Bible in his *Etymologiae*,¹²⁷ he abandons this tally in his *De ecclesiasticis officiis*. Here Isidore, at odds with Augustine’s count, not only states that there are seventy-two books, but also goes further to connect the number of books to the more common typologies:

Hii sunt libri canonici LXXII, et ob hoc Moyses LXX<II> elegit presbiteros qui prophetarent, ob hoc et Iesus dominus noster LXXII discipulos praedicare mandauit; et quoniam LXXII linguae in hoc mundo erant dif-

¹²² T.N. HALL, “Ælfric and the Epistle to the Laodicians”, in *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* – ed. K. POWELL – D. SCRAGG, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 65-83, at pp. 76-77; and *idem*, “Biblical and Patristic Learning”, in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature* – ed. P. PULSIANO – E. TREHARNE, Oxford, 2001, pp. 327-344, at p. 332.

¹²³ Cass., *Inst.*, I.12-14, pp. 36-39 (= Cassiodorus Senator, *Institutiones* – ed. R.A.B. MYNORS, Oxford, 1937, rpt., 1963).

¹²⁴ Cass., *Inst.*, I.13.2, p. 39 [n. 123].

¹²⁵ For the relevant text of the Codex Amiatinus, see H.J. WHITE, “The Codex Amiatinus and its Birthplace”, in *Studies in Biblical and Patristic Criticism, or Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, vol. 2 – ed. S.R. DRIVER – T.K. CHEYNE – W. SANDAY, Oxford, 1890, rpt. 2006, pp. 273-308, at p. 297. For the relationship between the Codex Grandior and the Codex Amiatinus in regard to the number of biblical books, see P. MEYVAERT, “Bede, Cassiodorus, and the Codex Amiatinus”, *Speculum*, 71 (1996), pp. 827-883, at pp. 839-844.

¹²⁶ See K. CORSANO, “The First Quire of the Codex Amiatinus”, *Scriptorium*, 41 (1987), pp. 3-34, at p. 26 and n. 89.

¹²⁷ Is., *Ety.*, VI.ii.1-50 [n. 102].

fusae, congrue prouidit spiritus sanctus ut tot libri essent quot nationes quibus populi et gentes ad percipiendam fidei gratiam aedificarentur.

These are the seventy-two canonical books, and in connection to this, Moses chose seventy(-two) elders who prophesied; in connection to this Jesus our Lord commanded seventy-two disciples to preach, and because seventy-two languages had been dispersed in this world, suitably did the Holy Spirit arrange that there would be just as many books as nations, in which the people and nations would be built up by receiving the grace of faith.¹²⁸

For the first time, Isidore in these lines connects almost all of the elements involving the number seventy-two together in typological fashion; even the number of Moses' elders is slotted into the list, although some emendation of the text is necessary. Though this passage finally reveals the fullest potential of the typological use of the number seventy-two, its simplicity is deceptively original in light of the preceding numerological tradition; it ignores (or is perhaps ignorant of) the many complex issues surrounding the numeration of the biblical books, of Moses' elders, of Jesus' disciples according to Luke 10, and of the languages and nations of the world in order to promote a neat, unified system exhibiting the providential patterns of the world for those able to tease them out. Isidore's typological interpretation is able to show that salvation history from the dispersal of nations and languages into seventy-two to the conversion of the world by seventy-two elders, disciples and biblical books has a numerological harmony that makes God's role in the world difficult to dispute. And after Isidore, many medieval authors, especially those of Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England, found the typological potential of the number seventy-two too appealing to ignore.¹²⁹

Isidore's contribution to the tradition does not end here. Elsewhere, he provides another important step in the development of the typology by connecting the number of languages dispersed at Babel with the number

¹²⁸ Is., *Ecc. Off.*, I.xi.7, p. 11 (= Isidorus Hispalensis, *De ecclesiasticis officiis* – ed. C.M. LAWSON, Turnhout, 1989 [CC SL, 113]).

¹²⁹ See HALL, "Biblical and Patristic Learning", p. 332 [n. 122]. For an Irish example, see ps.-Is., *Ques.*, 3, p. 197 (= pseudo-Isidorus, *Questiones sancti Hydidori tam de nouo quam de uetere testamentum*, in *Scriptores Hiberniae minores*, part 1 – ed. R.E. McNALLY, Turnhout, 1973 [CC SL, 108B]): "Iuxta septuaginta duae linguas, septuaginta duo libri intellecuntur", "According to the seventy-two languages, it is understood that there are seventy-two books". For Anglo-Saxon England, see Ald., *Car. uirg.*, 1623-1627, p. 420 (= Aldhelmus, *Carmen de uirginitate*, in *Aldhelmi opera* – ed. R. EHWARD, Berlin 1909 [MGH Auct. Antiq., 15]); Alc., *Car.* LXIX.21, p. 288 (= Alcuinus, *Carmina* – ed. E. DÜMMLER, Berlin, 1881 [MGH PLC, 1]); and Ælfric, *Hept.*, 836-843, p. 227 (= Ælfric, *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's Libellus de ueteri testament et nouo*, vol. 1 – ed. R. MARSDEN, Oxford, 2008 [EETS, 330]). See also MEYER, *Die Zahlenallegorese*, pp. 97-101 [n. 3].

of languages spoken at Pentecost. Whereas such a connection may seem obvious in light of the frequent typological association between Pentecost and Babel,¹³⁰ Isidore is the first author to state that the number of languages at both events is seventy-two.¹³¹ In his *Allegoriae*, he writes: “Viri septuaginta duo seniores, super quod cecidit Spiritus Dei, septuaginta duas nationum linguas in hoc mundo diffusas ostendunt, ex quibus multi credentes gratiam Spiritus sancti acceperunt”, “The seventy-two elders whom the Spirit of God came upon revealed the seventy-two languages of the nations—languages that were dispersed in this world from which many believers received the grace of the Holy Spirit”.¹³² Although the association with seventy-two languages and Pentecost will never become very widespread, other writers after Isidore will make the same connection.¹³³ Isidore frequently reveals his ingenuity and originality in his ability to adapt the material of his predecessors for new purposes; his usage of the number seventy-two is no exception.

7. Canon Law

It will also be briefly mentioned that the number seventy-two had some symbolic significance in early canon law that verges on but never reaches the same extent of the Isidorian typologies. According to the *Constitutum Silvestri*, a sixth-century forgery under Pope Symmachus, attributed to the fourth-century Pope Sylvester,¹³⁴ a bishop cannot be condemned by fewer

¹³⁰ See the examples provided by N. ADLER, *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest: Sinn und Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes Apg 2, 1-13* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1938), pp. 1-18.

¹³¹ See WEIGAND, “The Two and Seventy Languages of the World”, 257 [n. 5], who states “a case that fairly cries for identification with our tradition [i.e. of the seventy-two languages of the world] is the Pentecostal miracle [...] Up to the present I have not come across any instance of such a version [i.e. that connects Pentecost with the seventy-two languages], but it is a fair expectation that one may turn up”. Though Pacian does not connect Pentecost with Babel numerologically, he does predate Isidore in his connection between the 120 disciples of Acts 1,15 and the total number of languages of the world; see above.

¹³² Isidore, *Allegoriae quaedam sacrae scripturae*, PL 83, col. 109B-110A, 65.

¹³³ Notably, Ald., *Ep. Ac.*, pp. 67-68 (=Aldhelmus, *Epistula ad Acircium*, in *Aldhelmi opera* – ed. EHWALD [n. 129]), states that seventy languages were spoken at Pentecost, as does an anonymous Old English homily, *HomU* 35.1, 16-20, p. 211 (= “Sunnandæges spell” (XLIII), in *Wulfstan: Sammlung der ihm zugeschriebenen Homilien nebst Untersuchungen über ihre Echtheit*, vol. 1 – ed. A.S. NAPIER, Berlin, 1883, rpt. with a bibliographical appendix by K. OSTHEEREN, 1967), state that there were seventy-two languages. As late as the thirteenth century, Cardinal Hugo of St-Cher states that there were seventy-two languages spoken at Pentecost; see ADLER, *Das erste christliche Pfingstfest*, p. 8 [n. 130].

¹³⁴ For the Symmachian forgeries, see W.T. TOWNSEND, “The So-Called Symmachian Forgeries”, *The Journal of Religion*, 13 (1933), pp. 165-174, and esp. pp. 169-170 for the

than seventy-two other bishops: “non damnabitur praesul nisi in LXXII”.¹³⁵ Although the *Constitutum Silvestri* seems to be the first to state the importance of the presence of seventy-two bishops in ecclesiastical councils, there is some precedent for the significance of this number in earlier judicial history.¹³⁶ For example, the Talmud, which may lie at the heart of this canonical tradition, states that a Sanhedrin made up of seventy-one is needed to condemn certain persons and towns, or to wage an offensive war.¹³⁷ Among Christian authors, Augustine claims that there were seventy-two Manichean bishops: “episcopus [sc. Manichaeorum] autem septuaginta duos, qui ordinantur a magistris”, “there are seventy-two bishops [of the Manicheans], who are ordained by the masters”;¹³⁸ and it is reported that there were seventy-two bishops present at a synod in Rome under Symmachus (March 499), at the Third Council of Toledo (May 589), and at a synod under Boniface III (February–November 607).¹³⁹ Though the canonical significance of seventy-two bishops must have arisen at least superficially in connection with the similar (though not exact) number of the Sanhedrin and with Christ’s seventy-two disciples, it does not seem to have gained much momentum until long after Symmachus’ *Constitutum Silvestri*, and the related *Sinuessanae synodi gesta de Marcellino* which “was fabricated to prove that the pope could not be judged by his inferiors”.¹⁴⁰ In fact, it was not until after the ninth century that the extremely influential pseudo-Isidorian collection of forged decretals, which, in the words of Horst Fuhrmann, were intended “to protect suffragan bishops from intervention by the metropolitans, the provincial synods, or the secular power”, and thereby make “trial procedure and the possibility of deposing bishops [...] immeasurably difficult”,¹⁴¹ employed the canon on the need for sev-

Constitutum Silvestri; and J. RICHARDS, *The Pope and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476-753*, London, 1979, p. 82.

¹³⁵ *Con. Sil.*, 109-110, p. 236 (= *Das Konzil Silvesters mit 284 Bischöfen*, in *Zwei Päpste in Rom: Der Konflikt zwischen Laurentius und Symmachus [498-514]: Studien und Texte* – ed. E. WIRBELAUER, Munich, 1993).

¹³⁶ S. KUTTNER, “Cardinalis: The History of a Canonical Concept”, *Traditio*, 3 (1945), pp. 129-214, at pp. 202-203, briefly sketches the canonical origins and development of the rule that a bishop could only be disposed by seventy-two of his peers.

¹³⁷ *San.*, p. 38 (= *Tractate Sanhedrin* – trans. H. DANBY, London, 1919).

¹³⁸ Aug., *Haer.*, XLVI.xvi.172-173, p. 318 (= S. Aurelius Augustinus, *De haeresibus* – ed. R. VANDER PLAETSE – C. BEUKERS, Turnhout, 1969 [CC SL, 46]).

¹³⁹ RICHARDS, *The Pope and the Papacy in the Early Middle Ages, 476-753*, p. 70 (Symmachus), p. 261 (Boniface III) [n. 134], and R. COLLINS, *Visigothic Spain, 409-711*, Malden, MA, 2004, p. 67 (Toledo).

¹⁴⁰ RICHARDS, *The Popes and the Papacy*, p. 82 [n. 134].

¹⁴¹ H. FUHRMANN, “The Pseudo-Isidorean Forgeries”, in *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages* – ed. W. HARTMANN – K. PENNINGTON, History of Medieval Canon Law 2, Washington,

enty-two bishops as found in the *Constitutum Silvestri*. From this point on the notion that seventy-two bishops were needed to condemn another became standard in canonical thought.¹⁴²

8. Conclusion

From obscure origins, the symbolic and typological significance of the number seventy-two vastly develops by the end of Late Antiquity, especially among Latin authors. In all likelihood, the symbolism of number, which only finds support in the Old Testament under the number seventy, may have remained in obscurity if it were not for various fortuitous circumstances. The existence of the variant in Luke 10,1 that attributes seventy-two to the number of disciples that Christ sent out to preach greatly increased the importance of the number through the typological associations—so much in fact that by the Middle Ages, the Gospel's variant of seventy had almost completely disappeared. Moreover, by the time Isidore was alive and writing, the number seventy-two had attracted enough attention that it could be further developed and used for other atypical purposes. The total number of biblical books, which had previously been counted at seventy-one, would probably not have made the leap to seventy-two if it were not for the previously established typology that gave the number seventy-two so much significance; and if the number of bishops needed to condemn another bishop does not have its direct origins in the number of the Sanhedrin or the disciples sent out by Christ, it must have been significantly strengthened by the growing importance of the number. The number seventy-two may not have been the most prominent number in late antique and early medieval literature, but its numerology did enjoy a wide ranging and complex development due to its symbolic and growing typological importance. For these reasons, it should not be ignored in the history of Christian thought.

DC, 2001, pp. 135-195, at p. 142. The relevant canon in the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals can be found in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et capitula Angilramni* – ed. P. HINSCHIUS, Leipzig, 1863, II, p. 449.

¹⁴² Alc., *Ep.*, CLXXIX, p. 297.21-22; and *Ep.* CCXLV, p. 395.30-32 (= Alcuinus, *Epistolae*, in *Epistolae Karolini aevi* – ed. E. DÜMMLER, Berlin, 1895 [*MGH Epp.*, 4]), who appeals to the special validity of a canon ratified by seventy-two bishops as valid, may have played an intermediary role between the *Constitutum Silvestri* and the pseudo-Isidorian decretals.

Summary

This article treats the widespread and complex symbolism of the number seventy-two from the Table of Nations in Genesis 10 to Isidore of Seville in the early seventh century. Whereas later authors attribute the notion of seventy or seventy-two original nations and languages in the world to Genesis 10, the literary and religious significance of the number symbolism in early Jewish and Christian literature stems more likely from other sources such as the *Letter of Aristeas* which first gives the number of translators of the Septuagint as seventy-two, and the Gospel of Luke which describes Jesus sending out seventy or seventy-two disciples. Although many authors are indebted to their inherited literary traditions, symbolic usage of the number seventy-two can be idiosyncratic and prone to unique developments. Much of the symbolic usage of the number seventy-two begins to form in earnest after Augustine, when the number could be employed for typological purposes. While early Jewish and Christian use of the number seventy-two remained strictly symbolic, later Christians, particularly Isidore of Seville, exploited the typological potential of the number. Though the seventy-two languages in the world and the seventy-two disciples sent out by Christ remain the commonest motifs, authors could also associated the number with the total tally of biblical books, of hours in a three day period, of Moses' elders and the Sanhedrin, and of bishops needed to dispose of another bishop.

A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor: John Chrysostom's Discourse on Almsgiving Reinterpreted*

Maria VERHOEFF

(Leuven)

1. Introduction

This paper will deal with the remarkable concept of God as debtor in Chrysostom's writings. The key to understanding Chrysostom's entire motif of making God one's debtor is almsgiving.¹ Chrysostom calls this 'a matter of merchandise', meaning that it is in man's power to make God one's debtor. Traditionally this is called redemptive almsgiving, i.e. "giving alms in order to attain one's own salvation."² At first sight, this could give

* The research for this paper was carried out at Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, and was made possible by a Ph.D. fellowship granted to the author by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO). I would like to thank Donald Fairbairn, Johan Leemans, Wendy Mayer and Martin Webber for their insightful comments on various versions of this paper.

¹ There is no point in duplicating here work already done by scholars to establish a full understanding of Chrysostom's view on almsgiving. Just before the final version of this article was submitted I gratefully received the information on the arrival of a new publication on this topic: Eric COSTANZO, *Harbor for the Poor. A Missiological Analysis of Almsgiving in the View and Practice of John Chrysostom* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2013). With regard to this article in particular the sections on the language of mutuality and exchange (pp. 73-39) and redemptive almsgiving (pp. 98-109) are important. However, a detailed analysis of the God as debtor language is not presented in this publication. See also Blake LEYERLE, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money," *Harvard Theological Review* 87, (1994): 29–47; Eun Hye LEE, "John Chrysostom, a Glorious Failure: The Poor, the Rich and the Authentic Christian Community" (PhD Dissertation, Drew University, 2003); Wendy MAYER, "Poverty and Generosity Towards the Poor in the Time of John Chrysostom," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*, ed. Susan R. HOLMAN, Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History 1 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2008), 140–158.

² See Roman GARRISON, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement 77 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993). Definition by Bronwen NEIL, "Models of Gift Giving in the Preaching of Leo the Great,"

the impression of a pure doctrine of merit, especially when it is explained as a certain *do ut des* principle that governs Chrysostom's ethics.³

A systematic analysis of Chrysostom's concept of God as debtor, however, confirms Michael Sherwin's conclusion that friendship with God forms the framework for Chrysostom's conception of almsgiving.⁴ By linking the biblical idea that the poor are friends of God to the Graeco-Roman idea that benevolence is based on a prior relationship, Chrysostom does not depict almsgiving as a redemptive activity in itself or "by its own nature"⁵, but shows that redemption is friendship with God. Thus, the basis for Chrysostom's moral discourse on making God a debtor is not a doctrine of merit, but the process of maintaining friendship with God. This offers an important nuance both to current interpretations of patristic views on economic exchange and redemptive almsgiving, and to the interrelation between ethics and soteriology in Chrysostom.

This essay will explore Chrysostom's idea of friendship with God in relation to his views about merchandise. The passages on which the essay focuses have been chosen based primarily on the author's broad reading of Chrysostom's oeuvre. These passages are supplemented with others discovered through word searches using the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae database.

2. *Having God as Debtor is a Matter of Merchandise*

It is well-known that Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving is surrounded by commercial language of investment, reciprocity, inheritance and merchandise.⁶ According to Anastasia Sifonou, Chrysostom constructs his appeal for charity around the idea of retribution: "Cette retribution (enten-

Journal of Early Christian Studies 18 (2010): 225. See e.g. *De paen. hom.* 3.6 "<Almsgiving> pays the debt demanded by sin. [...] <R>egardless of how many other sins you have, your almsgiving counterbalances all of them." (*PG*, 49.293.26-30; FOTC); *De paen. hom.* 3.9 "Almsgiving is the salvation of the soul.<λύτρον ψυχῆς ἐστὶν ἐλετημοσύνη>" (*PG*, 49.294.36-37; FOTC)

³ See A. SIFONIOU, "Les fondements juridiques de l'aumône et de la charité chez Jean Chrysostome," *Revue de Droit Canonique* 14 (1964): 250 and G. J. M. BARTELINK, "Die Parrhesia des Menschen vor Gott bei Johannes Chrysostomus," *Vigiliae Christianae* 51 (1997): 266.

⁴ Michael SHERWIN, "Friends at the Table of the Lord: Friendship with God and the Transformation of Patronage in the Thought of John Chrysostom," *New Blackfriars* 85 (2004): 387–398. "The language of friendship with God [...] provides Chrysostom with a powerful instrument for the transformation of patronage." p. 398.

⁵ COSTANZO, *Harbor for the Poor*, 104.

⁶ Cf. Rudolf BRÄNDLE, *Matth. 25, 31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomos*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese 22 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck, 1979), 215-217.

dons les bénédictions célestes ou les graces divines) est conçue comme un service rendu en équivalence (ἀμοιβή) de la charité pratiquée, comme un salaire (μισθός, μισθοδοσία), parfois même comme une transaction commerciale (ἐμπορία).⁷

It is a matter of merchandise, since more will be received than given.⁸ While in terms of human economics this giving would be seen as losing one's property, in Chrysostom's rhetoric of reversal it is exactly the opposite in the divine economy. Giving is actually receiving.⁹

In the background of Chrysostom's thought lies the Scripture passage of Proverbs 19:17, widely used in the context of almsgiving:¹⁰ 'he who shows mercy to the poor man lends to the Lord', which is interpreted by Chrysostom as a contract or bond (χειρόγραφά).¹¹ "When one 'lends' to the poor through almsgiving, God functions as a 'co-signer,' such that he is responsible for repaying the alms (Prov. 19:17)."¹² Along with an identification

⁷ SIFONIOU, A. "Les fondements juridiques de l'aumône et de la charité chez Jean Chrysostome," 250. Cf. LEYERLE: "his sermons on almsgiving resound with the language of investment," LEYERLE, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money," 29. Cf. SILKE SITZLER, "Identity: The Indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom," *Vigiliae Christianae* 63 (2009): 475–476.

⁸ *In Matt. hom.* 66 (PG, 58.632.2 and 41–42; NPNF): "though you pay little by little, He receives it" [...] "He Himself makes the traffic (ἐμπορίας) the more gainful for you" [...] "let us traffic in that good merchandise" (ἀλλ' ἐμπορευώμεθα τὴν καλὴν αὐτὴν πραγματείαν). Cf. *In Rom. hom.* 21, 3 (PG, 60.606.26).

⁹ *In 1 Tim. hom.* 14 (PG, 62.573.63–574.23; NPNF). "Thus you receive more than you give, you are benefited more than you benefit. You lend to God, not to men. You increase your wealth, rather than diminish it." Cf. *De paenit. hom.* 3.8 (PG, 49.294.25–28; FOTC) "Give bread and seize paradise. Give small things and grasp great ones. Give mortal things and take firm hold of immortal ones. Give corruptible things and capture incorruptible ones." Mayer notes: "Concomitantly, in this same world view a failure to exercise almsgiving attracts proportional repayment, framed as punishment, if not here on earth, then in terms of God's inescapable wrath in the life to come." (Referring to *In Gen. hom.* 31; PG, 53, 284, ll. 13–29 and *De Lazaro conc.* 3; PG, 48, 996–1004, and *conc.* 6; PG, 48, 1040–1044.) Wendy MAYER, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities*, by Pauline ALLEN, Bronwen NEIL, and Wendy MAYER, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* 28 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009), 103.

¹⁰ See Richard FINN, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 178.

¹¹ *In Matt. hom.* 66 (PG, 58.632.7).

¹² Bradley C. GREGORY, *Like an Everlasting Signet Ring: Generosity in the Book of Sirach*, Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 2 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010), 192. Cf. Basil of Caesarea's argumentation in his sermon *Homilia in psalmum 14 secunda*: "What is the counsel of the Master? 'Lend to those from whom you do not hope to receive again.' [Lk 6.34] 'But what kind of loan is this,' some will say, 'that is not linked to a hope of return?' Only consider the meaning of these words, and you will wonder at the kindness of the Lawgiver. When you are about to give to a poor person on the Lord's account, that

of the recipients with Christ on the basis of Matthew 25:35-46, Chrysostom portrays almsgiving as a favour done to Christ.¹³ By giving to those who cannot or do not give in return, one makes God a debtor.¹⁴ With this motivation Chrysostom urges his audience to keep the future reward in mind and thus to give out of self-interest.¹⁵ “Christ stands ready to receive and to keep a close watch over your deposits for you – and not only to keep a close watch, but even to augment them, and pay them back with a lot of interest!”¹⁶

same gift is also a loan: it is a gift because you do not hope to receive it back again, but a loan because the Master in his great beneficence undertakes to make repayment for the poor person. He receives a little in the guise of the poor, but gives back much on their behalf. ‘The one who has mercy on the poor lends to God.’ [Prov 19.17 LXX]” transl. C. Paul SCHROEDER, *On Social Justice: St Basil the Great*, Popular Patristic Series (2009), 97-98.

¹³ The identification of the needy with Christ on the basis of Matthew 25:35-46, so that in giving alms the donors showed their love for Christ, is a common thread among the fathers. See Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 183, who quotes Susan Holman who stated that this is a dominant theme throughout all three Cappadocians’ writings on poverty relief. Susan R. HOLMAN, “The Entitled Poor: Human Rights Language in the Cappadocians,” *Pro Ecclesia* 9 (2000): 483. For a revised and more detailed study see Susan R. Holman, “Healing the World with Righteousness? The Language of Social Justice in Early Christian Homilies,” in *Charity and Giving in Monotheistic Religions*, ed. Miriam Frenkel and Yaacov Lev, *Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients* 22 (Berlin/NY: DeGruyter, 2009), 89–110. See also Anderson: “The linkage of Prov. 19:17 and Matt 25:31-46 becomes standard for almost all commentators after Irenaeus”. Gary A. ANDERSON, “You Will Have Treasure in Heaven,” in *New Approaches to the Study of Biblical Interpretation in Judaism of the Second Temple Period and in Early Christianity*, ed. Gary A. Anderson, Ruth A. Clements, and David Satran, *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 106 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 110., note 9). Mayer speaks of ‘the sacramental dimension of the concept of positive reciprocity’: “one encounters Christ in the recipient of almsgiving, just as one encounters him in the eucharist”. MAYER, “John Chrysostom on Poverty,” 103. See also BRÄNDLE, *Matth. 25, 31-46 Im Werk Des Johannes Chrysostomos*.

¹⁴ *In Matt. hom.* 15 (PG, 57.235.48); *In Col. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.304.15-16); *In Eph. hom.* 22 (PG, 62.157.14-17).

¹⁵ For the argument that John appeals to the self-interest of the wealthy by describing the results of almsgiving as *philotimia* see LEYERLE, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money,” as referred to by MAYER, “John Chrysostom on Poverty,” 102, note 209. Neil: “Both the rabbinic and Christian acceptance of self-interest as a valid motivation for charitable giving can be read as a pragmatic response to human moral limitations. The language of debt and credit made almsgiving a transaction in a spiritual economy.” NEIL, “Models of Gift Giving in the Preaching of Leo the Great,” 244.

¹⁶ *De statuis hom.* 2 (PG, 49.41) see LEYERLE, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money,” 38. Cf. *In Rom. hom.* 7 (PG, 60.450.63-451.5; NPNF) “But if you give it to Me through the poor, I keep it all for you exactly, and in fit season will return it with great increase. For it is not to take it away that I receive it, but to make it a larger amount and to keep it more exactly, that I may have it preserved for you against that time, in which there is no one to lend or pity.”

Chrysostom's treatment of "heaven [a]s a business and an enterprise"¹⁷ is, however, not based only on almsgiving. Displaying gratitude for both received benefits,¹⁸ being thankful for bad things (suffering, sickness, being falsely accused),¹⁹ forgiving those who are indebted to us,²⁰ praying,²¹ and obedience²² are all described by Chrysostom as deeds or attitudes for which God counts Himself to be indebted to man, for which He will repay mankind.²³ The following sections will show that in the case of almsgiving, Chrysostom is not so much focused on the gift element, as on the disposition of the donor and the relationship between donor and God as recipient.

3. *God, the Benefactor, appearing as Debtor*

While almsgiving dominates Chrysostom's texts and illustrations about having God as debtor, Chrysostom does not propose a simple doctrine of merit governed by the principle of reciprocity, as if almsgiving literally should be interpreted as having redemptive power in itself.²⁴ Chrysostom makes (appearing as) debtor characteristic of God, the original benefactor, rather than putting it into man's power to achieve this.²⁵ Chrysostom regularly depicts God as deliberately choosing to be a debtor over against

¹⁷ *De paen. hom.* 3.8 (PG, 49.294.24-25) "Ἐμπορία καὶ πραγματεία ὁ οὐρανός".

¹⁸ *In Gen. hom.* 18.15 (PG, 53.154.4-7).

¹⁹ *In Heb. hom.* 33 (PG, 63.230.13-17); *Exp. in Ps.* 9 (PG, 55.121.45-56).

²⁰ *In Matt. hom.* 15 (PG, 57.238.34-36); *In Philm. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.707.31-37), referring to the Lord's prayer in Mt. 6:13.

²¹ *In Matt. hom.* 22.7 (PG, 57.305.55-59).

²² Chrysostom about Abraham, as if God Himself speaks: "I owe him great reward for his obedience to me." *In Gen. hom.* 52.16 (PG, 54.461.10, FOTC)

²³ Cf. Gary A. Anderson's remark about Ephrem the Syrian: "The reference to the saints providing God with loans is so ubiquitous in Ephrem that one wonders whether the idea had shaken loose from its original biblical mooring and become a standard poetic trope. Indeed, all the acts of religious virtue practiced by the saints become a sort of currency that one could loan to God." Gary A. ANDERSON, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt, and the 'Treasury of Merit' in Early Judaism and Christianity," *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 62-63.

²⁴ Costanzo speaks of ambiguity and even inconsistency in Chrysostom, which makes it "difficult to ascertain whether or not John considered almsgiving to be a requirement for salvation or a necessary demonstration of salvation" and concludes: "Nevertheless, his teaching concerning redemptive almsgiving is problematic on account of rhetorical and biblical inconsistency." COSTANZO, *Harbor for the Poor*, 105 and 108.

²⁵ Chrysostom's logic of grace is: "if he gave when not in debt, much more will he repay after receiving." *De Anna* 3 (PG, 54.657.54-56), transl. R.C. HILL, *Homilies on Hannah, David and Saul*. Old Testament Homilies I (Brookline, Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2003); cf. *In Rom. hom.* 7 "For He that has given to one that has not given, how shall He not much rather give after He has received?"

men.²⁶ He even says that “He wishes Himself to be an archetypal debtor and guarantor” (καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ πρωτότυπος ὀφειλέτης καὶ ἐγγυητὴς εἶναι βούλεται).²⁷

Chrysostom’s language of God’s grace can refer either to an initial²⁸ or a responsive gift, and in this way he is similar to Basil of Caesarea. Richard Finn quotes Basil’s *Homilia in martyrem Julittam*, where Basil

“[...] gives an answer to the question put by the Psalmist: ‘what <can we> give back to the Lord for his gifts back to us?’ (Ps 116:10 LXX) [...] saying that God ‘in his munificence is not said to have *given* but *given back*, as though he were not the one who gave the first favour, but was repaying those who had made the first move. For the gratitude of those who have received gifts counts as a benefaction. He who has given you money asks for alms from you through the hand of the poor man. And if he takes what belongs to him, his kindness to you will lack nothing, as though what he took was yours.’”²⁹

Finn’s discussion of Basil here could also serve as a summary of Chrysostom’s thought: God’s favours, given as a reward for almsgiving, are His responsive gifts to men.

However, what is peculiar to Chrysostom is the idea that God’s action as debtor towards man is not limited to situations when people practice almsgiving. He further describes it as God’s original way of dealing with mankind. He wants to appear as a debtor even with regard to his initial gifts. And Chrysostom actually expresses this characteristic in the framework of friendship.

In his extensive excursus on friendship in *In 1 Thessalonicenses homilia 2*, Chrysostom gives the following description of a genuine friend:

²⁶ *In Matt. hom.* 22.7 (PG, 57.305.54-55); 76.5 (PG, 58.700.30-32) “For I, so far from asking you for a recompense of the things that I give you, to even make myself owe you a recompense for this very thing, if you be willing to use all I have.” (Εγὼ γὰρ ὧν δίδωμι οὐκ ἀπαιτῶ σε μισθόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ τούτου μισθόν σοι προσοφείλω, ἂν τοῖς ἐμοῖς χρήσασθαι βούληθῇς ἅπασι.); *In 2 Tim. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.606.27-29, FOTC).

²⁷ *In Matt. hom.* 15.13 (PG, 57.235.63-64).

²⁸ Chrysostom often gives a list of gifts God has already given. See for example *In Matt. hom.* 66 (PG, 58.632.13-19; NPNF): “For what you have received are these: He Himself made you a body, He Himself put in you a soul, He honored with speech you alone of the things on the earth, He gave you the use of all the things that are seen, He bestowed on you the knowledge of Himself, He gave up His Son for you, He gave you a baptism full of so many good things, He gave you a holy table, He promised a kingdom, and the good things that cannot be told.”

²⁹ *Homilia in martyrem Julittam 7* (PG, 31.253C-D). FINN, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 234. Translation and *italics* are his.

"He [a genuine friend³⁰] wishes rather to bestow a favor than to receive one, for he loves, and is so affected, as not having satisfied his desire. He is not so much gratified when good is done to him, as when he is doing good. For he wishes both to bestow favors, and not to seem to bestow them, but himself to be the debtor (ὀφειλέτην³¹). I think that perhaps many of you do not understand what has been said. He wishes to be the first in bestowing benefits, and not to seem to be the first, but to be returning a kindness."³²

While several of the classical commonplaces on friendship are mentioned in this homily, one of the often unnoticed characteristics of a real friend according to Chrysostom is appearing as debtor instead of benefactor.

The immediately-following section of this homily makes it clear that Chrysostom depicts God as this kind of genuine friend to man:

"Which God also has done in the case of men. He purposed to give His own Son for us; but that He might not seem to bestow a favor, but to be indebted to us, He commanded Abraham to offer his son, that whilst doing a great kindness, He might seem to do nothing great. For when indeed there is no love [φιλία], we both upbraid men with our kindnesses and we exaggerate little ones; but when there is love, we both conceal them and wish to make the great appear small, that we may not seem to have our friend for a debtor, but ourselves to be debtors to him, in having him our debtor [ἵνα μὴ δόξωμεν ὀφειλέτην ἔχειν τὸν φίλον, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ αὐτῷ ὀφειλέται εἶναι ἐν τῷ ὀφειλέτην ἔχειν αὐτόν.]. I know that the greater part do not understand what is said, and the cause is, that I am speaking of a thing which now dwells in heaven."³³

Thus while the gift of His Son is actually God's initial gift, Chrysostom says, God wanted to make it appear to be a responsive gift, treating the benefit as if it were a repayment. And thus God Himself created a condi-

³⁰ τῶν φίλων τῶν γνησίων (PG, 62.403.55-56); In the same homily he calls them also 'spiritual friends' (φίλων τῶν πνευματικῶν; PG, 62.404.28) and 'friends according to Christ' (φίλοι οἱ κατὰ Χριστόν; PG, 62.404.34).

³¹ Chrysostom appears to use *χρεώστης* and *ὀφειλέτης* interchangeably, see for example *In Rom. hom.* 7 (PG, 60.453.32 and 43). The latter word is however used more frequently.

³² *In 1 Thess. hom.* 2 (PG, 62.404.58-405.3; NPNF).

³³ *In 1 Thess. hom.* 2 (PG, 62.405.3-14; NPNF). An almost identical passage can be found in *In Hebraeos homilia* 25: "For inasmuch as a great favor was to be given to men, He, wishing to do this, not by favor, but as a debtor [ὀφειλέτης], arranges that a man should first give up his own son on account of God's command, in order that He himself might seem to be doing nothing great in giving up His own Son, since a man had done this before Him; that He might be supposed to do it not of grace, but of debt. For we wish to do this kindness also to those whom we love, others, to appear first to have received some little thing from them, and so give them all: and we boast more of the receiving than of the giving; and we do not say, We gave him this, but, We received this from him." (PG, 63.174.7-20; NPNF).

tion by commanding Abraham to offer his son, so that He might appear as debtor. Chrysostom uses a similar line of reasoning regarding almsgiving: "... God instituted almsgiving not just so that those in need (οἱ δεόμενοι) might be fed, but also so that those who provide might be the object of caritative acts (εὐεργετῶνται)."³⁴

In reality, Chrysostom acknowledges, it is of course not God but man who owes many debts. On the basis of Luke 17:10 ("We are unworthy servants; we have only done our duty"), Chrysostom says that if one displays charity, it is just a response out of indebtedness, and that even the goods one is distributing are not one's own, but God's.³⁵ At the same time, Chrysostom acknowledges that God does not *need* anything from men, nor is one capable of bestowing anything on Him, and thus in fact recompensing God for his loving-kindness is impossible.

Despite this, Chrysostom says, God even counts one's deeds as favours being done to Him.³⁶ As a consequence it is not so much man's indebtedness to God but God's φιλανθρωπία³⁷ that Chrysostom puts forward as the motivating power in his exhortation to do good. Chrysostom presents Christ as saying:

"Hence also of you that owest Me the requital of benefits without number, I make not demand as of one that owes, but crown you as one that favors Me, and a kingdom do I give you for these small things. For I do not say so much as put an end to My poverty, or give Me riches, and yet I did become poor for you; yet still I ask for bread and clothing, and a small solace for My hunger. [...] and I shall have received favor enough, and for this only will I give you Heaven. [...] For I am able indeed to crown you even without all this; yet I would fain be a debtor to you <βούλομαι δέ σοι καὶ ὀφειλέτης εἶναι>, that the crown may give you some feeling of confidence <παρρησίαν>. This is why, though I am able to support Myself, I come

³⁴ *De eleemosyna* (PG, 51.266.38-56), as quoted by MAYER, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," 89.

³⁵ *In Rom. hom.* 7 (PG, 60.450.36-41); 14.2 (PG, 60.523.45-47); *In Gen. hom.* 34.18 (PG, 53.320.64-321.7)

³⁶ *In Gen. hom.* 29.25 (PG, 53.271.26-29); *In Matt. hom.* 22.7 (PG, 57.305.54-57). Chrysostom distinguishes between doing good, for which one has God as debtor, and receiving good, which makes one a debtor towards God. Working miracles, like raising the dead, belongs to the latter category and is valued as less important by Chrysostom than almsgiving. See *In Matt. hom.* 24 (PG, 57.323.1-3), *In 2 Cor. hom.* 16.5 (PG, 61.516.12-13), *In 2 Tim. hom.* 7 (PG, 62.639.46-49), *In Phil. hom.* 4 (PG, 62.209.10-13).

³⁷ Cf. Basil, *Hom. in Ps. 14 sec. (Against Those Who Lend at Interest)*: "You should expect the characteristics of philanthropy from the true Philanthropist." transl. SCHROEDER, *On Social Justice*, pp. 97-98. For a study of the central concept of φιλανθρωπία in Chrysostom see M. ZITNIK, "Theos Philanthropos bei Johannes Chrysostomos," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 41 (1975): 76-118.

about begging, and stand beside your door, and stretch out Mine hand, since My wish is to be supported by you. For I love you exceedingly, and so desire to eat at your table, which is the way with those that love a person <ὁ τοῖς φιλοῦσιν ἕθος ἐστὶ>. And I glory in this. And when the whole world are spectators, then am I to herald you forth, and in the hearing of all men to display you as My supporter.”³⁸

Thus, giving to the needy is counted as a returned favour, not so much as a repayment of the debt, but rather because in this way it satisfies the desire of the original benefactor to give new and higher favours (here: heaven).³⁹ “[H]is purpose is that we may provide him with occasions for granting us greater favor from himself.”⁴⁰

4. *The Interpretative Framework*

At this point we should come back to the fact that for Chrysostom the appearance of repaying instead of giving is the characteristic of a genuine friend. While Chrysostom was well aware of classical views on friendship (as is evident from his two quite extensive excursuses on friendship in his second homily on 2 Thessalonians and his first homily on Colossians⁴¹) the argument that a friend wants to make himself seem to be a debtor by treating a benefit as though it were a repayment does not seem to be a well-known (or at least noticed) argument in classical sources on friendship.⁴²

³⁸ *In Rom. hom.* 15; (PG, 60.548.16-26; NPNF); The importance of this text for Chrysostom's theology is indicated by Rudolf BRÄNDLE, “This Sweetest Passage: Matthew 25:31-46 and Assistance to the Poor in the Homilies of John Chrysostom,” in *Wealth and Poverty in the Early Church and Society*, ed. Susan R. HOLMAN, Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History 1 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2008).

³⁹ Cf. *In Matt. hom.* 76.5 (PG, 58.700.30-32).

⁴⁰ *In Gen. hom.* 29.25 (PG, 53.271.26-30; NPNF).

⁴¹ Some of the commonplaces Chrysostom refers to, for example, are “a faithful friend is the medicine of life” (*Ecclus.* 6.16), “truly a faithful friend is a strong defense” (ib. 14), “a friend is more to be longed for than the light” (cf. Cicero, *Lael.* 13, 47), “friends consider everything as common goods” (probably Pythagorean origin, cf. Plato, *Rsp.* IV, 424a) and ‘a friend is another self’ (Cicero, *Lael.* 21.80). Cf. Carolinne WHITE, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), p. 91.

⁴² Aristotle provides the most extended ancient discussion of friendship (φιλία) in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. A reference to the idea of wanting to appear as a debtor over against one's friend cannot be found. Aristotle however indicates that a friend wishes to be of assistance to another rather than to receive a benefit. He also states that friendship consists more in loving than in being loved and that the one who gives loves more than the one who owes. I owe this insight to David Konstan, via personal correspondence.

The only parallels this author has found for this thought are two references in Seneca's work *De beneficiis*.⁴³ After defining a benefit in the first book as consisting "not in what is done or given but rather in the intention of the giver or agent," (1.6.1) Seneca explains this principle⁴⁴ further by saying:

"For often we are more obliged to the person who gave us a small gift in grand manner, who 'matched the wealth of kings with his intention,' who gave little but did so freely, who ignored his own poverty while showing concern for mine, who was not just willing to help out but eager to do so, *who felt like he was receiving a benefit just because he was giving one*, who gave as though he would <not> later receive and received as though he had not given, *who watched for, even sought out, an opportunity to serve*."⁴⁵

In the fifth book, Seneca speaks directly to his friend Liberalis Aebutius, to whom the treatise is addressed:

"... your goodness has gone so far as that you regard a benefit conferred on anyone [else?] as conferred on yourself; (...) You yourself are so far from all boasting, so willing to free instantly from their obligation those whom you help, that, *whatever you confer on anyone, you wish to appear to be repaying, not giving* <*velis videri non praestare, sed reddere*>. Things given in this spirit will for that reason be returned to you in greater measure."⁴⁶

Seneca here describes the ideal benefactor as a friend who wishes to be seen as one repaying a gift received rather than as one who gives. These passages suggest that such giving results in benefit to the giver because what comes back is greater than the original gift. While these ideas are also present in Chrysostom, it cannot be proven that Chrysostom read Seneca. Even when Seneca is viewed as an example of the general ancient Graeco-Roman gift-giving system, these characteristics of the ideal benefactor seem to appear in the margins instead of receiving primary attention.⁴⁷

⁴³ Passages are quoted from Lucius Annaeus SENECA, *On Benefits*, trans. Miriam GRIFFIN and Brad INWOOD (University of Chicago Press, 2011).

⁴⁴ According to Griffin and Inwood, "a key point of Stoic theorizing". SENECA, *On Benefits*, p. 4 [Introduction].

⁴⁵ *De beneficiis* 1.7.1, "<not>" inserted by Griffin and Inwood; *italics* mine.

⁴⁶ *De beneficiis* 5.1.4, *italics* mine.

⁴⁷ Cf. Engberg-Pedersen, who compares Paul's use of the notion of χάρις with Seneca's *De beneficiis*. Troels ENGBERG-PETERSEN, "Gift-Giving and Friendship: Seneca and Paul in Romans 1-8 on the Logic of God's Χάρις and Its Human Response," *Harvard Theological Review* 101 (2008), p. 18. Engberg-Pedersen convincingly argues for an interpretation of Seneca's conception of gift-giving along the lines of a friendship relationship, since Seneca stresses the personal involvement between the donor and recipient. Although he quotes

Seneca may also differ from Chrysostom in calling this “most sacred bond of benefaction” precisely the bond “which is the source of friendship” (2.18.5), thus viewing friendship as the result rather than the cause of the exchange of benefits. Chrysostom appears to say the opposite about friendship, when he discusses true friendship or “ἡ πνευματικὴ ἀγάπη”:

“But the spiritual love is higher than all, as it were some queen ruling her subjects; and in her form is bright: for not as the other, has she anything of earth for her parent; neither habitual intercourse, nor benefits, nor nature, nor time; but she descends from above, out of heaven. And why do you wonder that she needs no benefits in order that she should subsist, seeing that neither by injuries is she overthrown? [...] For he who became a friend from receiving benefits, will, should these be discontinued, become an enemy.”⁴⁸

True friendship or spiritual love is thus described as a heavenly gift by Chrysostom.

It is probably within the Jewish-Christian tradition, rather than in the Graeco-Roman system of gift-giving, that antecedents of God as debtor and the related notion of redemptive almsgiving may be found. The doctrine of redemptive almsgiving was particularly evident in the Septuagint.⁴⁹ Almsgiving thus “mirror[s] the act of sacrifice”, according to Gary A. Anderson, “just as the altar was conceived of as a means of conveying a gift to heaven so the hand of the poor person is a conduit for gifts destined for God.”⁵⁰

Susan Sorek argues that unique aspects of the Jewish benefaction system influenced the development of Christian euergetism and charitable practice throughout the later Roman Empire. The distinctive Jewish benefaction system had little in common with the Graeco-Roman system of euer-

Joubert as explicitly rejecting the connection with friendship, he also cites Peterman and Griffin as advocating the connection with friendship. Note 19, p. 20.

⁴⁸ *In Col. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.303.19-26; NPNF).

⁴⁹ See Garrison: “Within early Christianity, the evolution of the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving cannot be attributed to the influence of the popular morality of the Graeco-Roman world.” “It is with the LXX that a more calculating doctrine of redemptive almsgiving emerges.” GARRISON, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 45 and 52. Cf. Susan SOREK, *Remembered for Good: A Jewish Benefaction System in Ancient Palestine* (Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2010), p. 237. Anderson also notes that “the concept of making a loan to God was not unknown in the Syriac tradition. This wisdom teaching form Proverbs, though slightly reworked, found its way into the Peshitta version of Sirach. “Give to God as he gives to you with a good eye and a large hand; for he who gives to the poor, lends to God; for who is a repayer if not he? For he is God who repays and he will repay you ten thousand times the thousand” (35:10-11).” GARY A. ANDERSON, “Redeem Your Sins”, p. 49, note 35.

⁵⁰ GARY A. ANDERSON, “You will have treasure in heaven”, p. 107.

getism.⁵¹ One of the distinctive aspects she mentions is the central notion of God as the great benefactor. "The intention was that benefactions should be undertaken on his behalf. [...] Doing good deeds to others earned recognition of merit for the individual from God, not necessarily from the recipient(s)."⁵² "To put it in euergetic terminology, God was the patron and humans were his clients."⁵³ Thus while Michael Sherwin has shown that "Chrysostom begins to transform *radically* the traditional notion of patronal friendship,"⁵⁴ this is expected to be motivated by a distinctive Jewish-Christian ideology, rather than being based solely on his own creativity.

Both Helen Rhee and Gary A. Anderson refer to several passages from early Christian and Late Antique writings that are reminiscent of the above-mentioned ideas of Chrysostom. Besides several examples of "the nearly universal calls to almsgiving for the purpose of forgiveness of sins in the early church,"⁵⁵ the economic language of exchange and transaction is shown by examples from Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvetur?*⁵⁶ and Ephrem the Syrian.⁵⁷ Examples indicating that one may possibly have God as a debtor or make God a debtor, although not pointing to God's original desire to be a debtor over against humankind, are shown in Augustine⁵⁸ and Cyprian.⁵⁹

⁵¹ Susan SOREK, *Remembered for Good*, p. 4 and 158. It is important to mention that the influence of the Jewish system "was to permeate the very system of euergetism (...). The 'popular morality' of the Jews, transmitted through the Christian doctrine of redemptive alms and charity, fused with pagan euergetism, found its ultimate expression in the benefaction system of the later Christian Roman Empire." p. 159. Thus, it would not be surprising to recognize elements of both systems in Chrysostom.

⁵² SOREK, *Remembered for Good*, p. 4.

⁵³ SOREK, *Remembered for Good*, p. 256.

⁵⁴ SHERWIN, "Friends at the Table of the Lord", p. 392. *Italics* mine.

⁵⁵ Helen RHEE, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich. Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation*. (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2012), p.76.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 81. and ANDERSON, "Redeem Your Sins." p. 58.

⁵⁷ ANDERSON, "Redeem Your Sins." pp. 58-64.

⁵⁸ "Listen to the Scripture telling you how to make the LORD your debtor, 'Anyone who gives alms to the poor is lending to the LORD.'" (Augustine, *Exp. 3, Psalm 36*. trans. by M. Boudling, *Exposition of the Psalms* (33-50), vol. 2, p 133). *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁵⁹ RHEE, *Loving the Poor*. p. 101. See also Brenda Llewellyn Ihssen who refers to Gregory of Nyssa's use of the concept of God as debtor in his treatise *Contra usurarios* (PG, 46:440): "Although Basil and other authors refer to such 'heavenly usury,' God's role is never more explicit as in Gregory's sermon. By means of a bold twist of terminology that seems almost profane, Gregory refers to God as the 'Debtor,' the 'χρεώστης'; now this is not a 'debtor' as either we or Gregory's audience understands the term, but one who has control over the entire world and its possessions, much like a parent over a child and all that the child possesses. In Gregory's text, God is a debtor (parent) who will wisely attend to the lender's needs in entirety if the lender (the child) will only give abundantly rather than demand what

Still, a linkage between these notions and friendship does not appear in these examples. Of course, Luke 16:9 with its call to "make friends using the Mammon of unrighteousness" is an often used Scripture passage in the context of almsgiving.⁶⁰ One possible connection might be perceived in Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur?*, where he comments on this Lukan verse:

"The Lord did not say, Give, or bring, or do good, or help, but make a friend. But a friend proves himself such not by one gift, but by long intimacy. For it is neither the faith, nor the love, nor the hope, nor the endurance of one day, but 'he that endureth to the end shall be saved.' How then does man give these things? For I will give not only to friends, but to the friends of friends. And who is it that is the friend of God? Do not you judge who is worthy or who is unworthy. For it is possible you may be mistaken in your opinion."⁶¹

In principle, "[a]ll the faithful, then, are good and godlike, and worthy of the name by which they are encircled as with a diadem." (36) Clement probably refers to the name friend of God, among other equivalent names of children and sons (cf. 31). Thus, Clement says "Open your compassion to all who are enrolled the disciples of God; not looking contemptuously to personal appearance, nor carelessly disposed to any period of life." (33). On the one hand, therefore, Clement seems to urge the rich to give to the Christian poor in general. The pious poor are able to intercede for them by God (35). On the other hand, Clement says "you must of necessity by all means find some one of those who have power with God to save." (33) From paragraph 36 on, Clement focuses on "some, the elect of the elect" (36), "some man of God" (41), who acts as an intermediary before God, to whom repentance (by almsgiving) must be directed, illustrated by the example of the apostle John (42).

Clement thus speaks of the elect as the friends of God in particular as intermediaries taking care of the salvation of the rich. Utilizing these means

is not his to secure." Brenda LLEWELLYN IHSEN, "Basil and Gregory's Sermons on Usury: Credit Where Credit Is Due", *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 16, (2008), p. 422-23.

⁶⁰ FINN, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, p. 179.

⁶¹ *Quis dives salvetur?* 32-33 (GCS 17); transl. William Wilson (ANF). A detailed study of Clement's concept of 'friend of God' and a further comparison with Chrysostom is not possible within the scope of this paper. The PhD dissertation by David O'Brien, "Rich Clients and Poor Patrons: Functions of Friendship in Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur?*" (University of Oxford, 2004), which was received by the author only just before submission of the final version of the article, is expected to provide helpful insights for further interpretation.

is actually defined by Clement as self care (40).⁶² Sherwin has pointed to a comparable way Chrysostom speaks both of the saints and the poor as the true friends of God, acting as emissaries of Christ.⁶³ But he also shows that Chrysostom emphasizes how the Christians themselves enter into divine friendship, while Clement seems to speak primarily of a mediated friendship.⁶⁴ Chrysostom's dominant focus is not on establishing a long, intimate relationship with the friends of God, but on cultivating one's friendship with God, given in the beginning at baptism.⁶⁵ This is illustrated further below.

5. *Cultivating Friendship with God*

As seen above, the focus in Chrysostom's calls to make God a debtor by almsgiving is not so much on the need (of the poor, let alone of God), nor on the gift element itself. The claim consists in the pre-existing personal relationship.⁶⁶ Chrysostom knows that gifts were usually bestowed on friends,⁶⁷ which concurs with the "prevailing Graeco-Roman attitude (...) that benefits should be given exclusively to those who were regarded as worthy (...), one's social peers, fellow-citizens, family members and friends."⁶⁸ Chrysostom speaks, however, about giving not only to friends but also (and even more so) to the stranger, and about not scrutinizing their behaviour but giving indiscriminately.⁶⁹ By re-describing the poor and

⁶² Compare the difference in explanation by RHEE, *Loving the Poor*, pp. 77-85 and Michael Nai-Chiu POON, "The Counsel Against Despair: A Study in John Chrysostom's Ethics" (University of Oxford, 1984). According to Poon the dominant emphasis in Clement is put on "the elite teachers of the mass" (p.75), making the church "a community under the rule of the friends of God." (p. 80) Poon concludes that Chrysostom rather speaks of "the church as a community of friends." (p. 80)

⁶³ SHERWIN, "Friends at the Table of the Lord", pp. 391 and 397.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 397.

⁶⁵ See for example *Catecheses ad illuminandos* 2.29 (SC 50bis, 2.29.13-16): "For He has granted you great confidence [παρρησίας], He has enrolled you in the front ranks of His friends [καὶ εἰς τοὺς πρώτους τῶν φίλων ἐγγράψας], and has received into the adoption of sons [καὶ εἰς τὴν υἱοθεσίαν ἀναγαγόν] you who were formerly captives and slaves with no right to speak out." Transl. by Paul W. HARKINS (ACW 31).

⁶⁶ Cf. Garrison who quotes L. Wm. COUNTRYMAN, *The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations*, Texts and Studies in Religion (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen Press, 1980), 105–106. GARRISON, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 41.

⁶⁷ *In Jo. hom.* 51 (PG, 59.284.55-285.3).

⁶⁸ GARRISON, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, 41.

⁶⁹ *In Heb. hom.* 11 (PG, 63.96.13-15); *De Lazaro conc.* 2 (PG, 48.989.61-990); *De eleemosyna* (PG, 51.270.55-60), all mentioned by MAYER, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," p. 102.

needy as friends of Christ,⁷⁰ Chrysostom upholds to the same principle, namely that the claim consists in cultivating friendship, defined as spiritual and divine friendship:

“Let us then follow after these friendships which are of the Spirit, for they are strong, and hard to be dissolved [...] For hear Christ saying in the Gospel, Call not your friends nor your neighbors, if thou make a feast, but the lame, the maimed. (Luke 14.12) [...] And he that invites his friends, has done no great thing: for he has received his recompense here. But he that called the maimed, and poor, has God for his Debtor <ἔχει τὸν Θεὸν ὀφειλέτην>. [...] Let us then not seek those out for our benefits, who have it in their power to requite us again, nor bestow our favors on them with such an expectation: this were a cold thought. If you invite a friend, the gratitude lasts till evening [...] But if you call the poor and the maimed, never shall the gratitude perish, for God, who remembers ever, and never forgets, you have even Him for your Debtor <τὸν γὰρ πάντοτε μνημονεύοντα Θεόν, καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐπιλανθάνομενον, ἔχεις αὐτὸν ὀφειλέτην.> [...] Christ comes unto you through him, and do you make petty calculations of such things? When you are inviting the King to your table, do you fear because of such things as these? [...] But those other tables [where the poor are invited] produce friendship, not with man, but with God [Ἄλλ’ ἐχεῖναι αἱ τράπεζαι φιλικὴν ποιοῦσιν, οὐχὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν].”⁷¹

Note that taking care of the poor and needy (here by inviting them to the table), “the faithful of Chrysostom’s congregation not only become the friends of God’s friends; they themselves become the friends of God.”⁷² Elsewhere, he puts it in other words, saying “let us reap the fruits of His friendship,” since “God is earnestly endeavouring to obtain our friendship.”⁷³

⁷⁰ In *In 1 Thess. hom.* 11.5 (PG, 62.468), Chrysostom calls them explicitly “the friends of Christ”. Cf. SHERWIN, “Friends at the Table of the Lord,” 396.

⁷¹ In *Col. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.299-309; NPNF).

⁷² SHERWIN, “Friends at the Table of the Lord,” p. 398.

⁷³ In *Heb. hom.* 23.6 (PG, 63.164.1; NPNF); cf. Sherwin, who discusses Chrysostom’s uniqueness in presenting God as a *pursuing* patron. “Unlike other patrons who stand aloof while prospective clients pursue them, Christ runs after them and seeks to draw them into his friendship”, according to Chrysostom. Ibid., pp. 393–394. In this text from the homily on Hebrews, Chrysostom actually complains that God’s pursuit remains unanswered: “For the friendship of men we often incur danger, but for that of God, we do not even give up money. Our [condition] does indeed call for mourning, for mourning and tears and wailings, and loud lamentation and beating of the breast. We have fallen from our hope, we are humbled from our high estate, we have shown ourselves unworthy of the honor of God; even after His benefits we are become unfeeling, and ungrateful. The devil has stripped us of all our good things. We who were counted worthy to be sons; we His brethren and fellow-heirs, are come to differ nothing from His enemies that insult Him.”

Fulfilling the need or obligation to give appears not as redemptive activity *per se*:

“Why, you ask, did he say, Call on me? Why does he wait to be called by us? Because he wishes to achieve a closer relationship with us and a more ardent love for him by giving and calling and receiving. <Μερίζονα τὴν οἰκείωσιν ἡμῖν ποιῆσαι βουλόμενος, καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν φιλίαν θερμότεραν, καὶ τῷ δοῦναι, καὶ τῷ καλεῖσθαι, καὶ τῷ λαμβάνειν.> Virtue, you see, brings us into relationship with God (πρὸς Θεὸν οἰκειοῖ), and the recompense has the same effect; prayer likewise promotes this relationship <ταύτην συγκροτεῖ τὴν οἰκείωσιν>. Hence he says, ‘Give to me and I shall give to you.’ Now, in the giving you also receive: he for his part has no need of your gift. And so even if you prove to be gentle, temperate and chaste, far from adding anything to God he apportions you great rewards and laurels for this as though you were of help to him.”⁷⁴

Chrysostom thus emphasizes sustaining the relationship with God. If one lends to God and thus provides occasions for God to be a debtor, this constitutes befriending God, entering into a relationship with God. The following passage is similar to the previous one: Chrysostom again adopts the rhetoric of reversal, and the passage shows how he uses a density of affective references to characterize this relationship:

“But if you beforehand puttest it [your possessions] out to interest with God, the treasure henceforward remains unassailable, and great is the facility wherewith that repayment will be made. For God is well pleased at repaying us what He owes, and both looks with a more favorable eye upon those who have lent to Him, than on those who have not; and loves those the most to whom He owes the most. And so, if you would have Him for your Friend continually, make Him your Debtor to a large amount <Ὡστε εἰ βούλει φίλον αὐτὸν ἔχειν διηνεκῶς, πολλῶν αὐτὸν κατὰστησον χρεώστην>. For there is no lender so pleased at having those that owe to him, as Christ is rejoiced at having those that lend to Him. And such as He owes nothing to, He flees from; but such as He owes to, He even runs unto. Let us then use

⁷⁴ *Exp. in Ps. 49 (50) (PG, 55.249.6-18)*. Transl. Robert C. Hill, *St. John Chrysostom: Commentary on the Psalms*. Vol. 1, Brookline, Holy Orthodox Press, 1998. Cf. Anderson’s explanation: “The sinner is something like a child who wishes to purchase a present for his mother for Christmas. Given the fact that his mother has provided the child with the funds, what exactly does the child give to her? At one level, the child gives nothing; he simply returns to his mother what was once hers. But at another level, this gift allows the child to part with something in order to express his gratitude. The gift does not create the relationship – the child need not do anything in order to be loved by his mother – but it does in some sense enact the love that characterizes it.” ANDERSON, “Redeem Your Sins.” p. 66

all means to get Him for our Debtor; for this is the season for loans, and He is now in want. [...] He thirsts, since He thirsts after your salvation.”⁷⁵

One recognizes in the two passages how Chrysostom focuses on the disposition of both giver and receiver. This is what defines the gift-element in Chrysostom's understanding of gift-giving.⁷⁶ The same focus on attitude also becomes clear in his regular references to cheerful giving, giving with willingness, motivated by 2 Corinthians 9:7, “God loves a cheerful giver” as a prerequisite for real almsgiving.⁷⁷

We already noted that having God as debtor is not only viewed as a reward of almsgiving, but is applied by Chrysostom to other situations, like gratitude, prayer, forgiveness and obedience in general. Chrysostom can also speak about love in broader terms using the language of debt, credit and investment. In *In Genesim homilia* 33.2, Chrysostom concludes on the basis of Romans 13:8 (“Don't owe anyone except to love one another”) that paying the debt of love increases wealth for both debtor and creditor.⁷⁸ A similar line of argumentation can be seen in his letter to Castus, Valerius, Diophantus, Cyriacus — presbyters of Antioch, to whom he writes as to intimate friends:

“Hence I also in my turn am never satisfied with the measure of affection for me which you have attained, but am always seeking to make additions to your love-draught, and daily demanding the discharge of your love debt which is always being paid, and yet is always owing (for it is written, ‘owe no man anything but to love one another’ [Romans 13:8]). I am indeed continually receiving what I ask in great abundance, yet never think that I have received the whole. Do not cease then to pay down this goodly debt, which has a twofold pleasure. For those who pay, and those who receive, derive equal enjoyment, inasmuch as they are both alike enriched by the payment; which in the case of money is an impossibility, for there the one who pays becomes poorer, and only the man who has received is richer. But this is not what commonly happens in the covenant of love. For he who pays

⁷⁵ *In Rom. hom.* 7 (PG, 60.453.35-454.4; NPNF).

⁷⁶ Cf. the same reasoning about how Seneca understands gift-giving by ENGBERG-PETERSEN, “Gift-Giving and Friendship,” p. 20.

⁷⁷ *De eleemosyna* (PG, 51.266.62); *In 2 Cor. hom.* 16.4 (PG, 61.532.28-33); *In 1 Tim. hom.* 14 (PG, 62.574.10); *In Phil. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.188.13). Cf. E.F. Bruck, “Die Gesinnung des Schenkers bei Johannes Chrysostomus. Bemerkungen zum Verhältnis zwischen theologischer und juristischer Willenslehre,” in *Mnemosyna Pappoulia* (Athens: 1934), pp. 65–83. Cf. Sorek: “The rabbis were especially concerned about the manner in which charity was dispensed. The prime consideration was that nothing be done that might shame the recipient. Rabbi Jonah [second century CE], speaking of Ps 41.2 said: ‘It is not written. ‘Happy is he who gives to the poor’ but ‘Happy is he who considers the poor.’” SOREK, *Remembered for Good*, p. 233.

⁷⁸ PG, 53.306.14-19; NPNF.

it is not less bereft of it, as in the case of money when it is transferred to the receiver; but payment of love makes him who pays richer than before.”⁷⁹

Although Chrysostom frames this message in terms of debt, credit and investment, this does not mean that he is talking merely about a mutual exchange of services as fulfilment of a formal obligation. Rather, the focus lies on the affection between the persons and their equal enjoyment, which is the ideal of friendship.

In that regard it is not accidental that Chrysostom describes God and man in parallel ways. Chrysostom exhorts his audience to adopt the same attitude – that of a genuine friend – in other words appealing to them to imitate God’s virtues, namely to act as receiving instead of giving, as if being benefited, gaining and not losing.⁸⁰ Chrysostom even calls almsgiving a grace because it makes us like God.⁸¹ A popular proof text for this in Chrysostom is Proverbs 20:6 (LXX): “Man is a great thing, and a merciful man a precious thing.” On the basis of this text, Chrysostom praises man’s natural affection. Man is by nature prone to mercy. “And why marvel at this being man?” says Chrysostom, “This is God.”⁸² Thus Chrysostom appears to remove to some extent the unequal character of the relationship between God and man, approaching the equality fitting to friendship.

The same is evident in the following text, where Chrysostom presents Christ as saying:

“For I, so far from asking you for a recompense of the things that I give you, to even make myself owe you a recompense for this very thing, if you be willing to use all I have.’ What can be equal to this munificence, ‘I am Father, I am brother, I am bridegroom, I am dwelling place, I am food, I am raiment, I am root, I am foundation, all whatsoever you will, I am.’ ‘Be thou in need of nothing, I will be even a servant, for I came to minister, not to be ministered unto; I am friend, and member, and head, and brother, and sister, and mother; I am all; only cling thou closely to me. I was poor for you, and a wanderer for you, on the cross for you, in the tomb for you, above I intercede for you to the Father; on earth I have come for your sake

⁷⁹ *Epist.* 22 (PG, 52.624.33-45; NPNF).

⁸⁰ *In 2 Cor. hom.* 16.4 (PG, 61.516.12-15).

⁸¹ *In 2 Cor. hom.* 16.4 (PG, 61.516.1; NPNF); cf. *In Phil. hom.* 1 (PG, 62.190.13); *In Heb. hom.* 33.8 (PG, 63.230.17) “τοῦτο ἡμεῖς ἐγγύς εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιεῖ.” Cf. Helen Rhee’s treatment of charity as “a fundamental marker for Christian identity because it is an imitation of God’s character” on the basis of examples from *1 Clement*, Lactantius and Cyprian. RHEE, *Loving the Poor*, p. 179.

⁸² *hom. in Mt.* (PG, 58.524.43; NPNF). Cf. “A great thing is man; why? ‘and an honorable thing is a merciful man.’ [Proverbs 20:6, LXX] For this is the true character of man, to be merciful, yea rather the character of God, to show mercy.” *hom. in Phil.* 4 (PG, 62.212.17-19; NPNF).

an ambassador from my Father. You are all things to me, brother, and joint heir, and friend, and member.”⁸³

He again presents the benefactor as wanting to be a debtor, if man is willing to enter into a relationship with Him; a relationship that is characterized by friendship and kinship, and is described in marital and sacramental language. Strikingly, Chrysostom presents it as a reciprocal relationship, since he even makes Christ out to say: “You are all things to me, brother, and joint heir, and friend, and member.” He did the same in an earlier homily on the Gospel of Matthew: “Share your goods with Christ. ... He is your brother, and joint-heir, make Him joint-heir with you here too. Whatsoever you give Him, you will give to yourself.”⁸⁴

Chrysostom thus adapts the language of debt, credit and investment in several ways to illustrate the relation between God and man, which is characterized as friendship (and thus naturally expresses itself by giving and receiving of favours) rather than a mere mutual contract following a *do ut des*-principle.

6. Conclusion

The present analysis of the concept of God as debtor in Chrysostom confirms previous studies on almsgiving and poverty in Chrysostom by Leyerle, Sherwin and Mayer, and also offers some new insights. Both the presence of calls to make loans to God, and notions of redemptive almsgiving in language of economical investment and transaction, based on Proverbs 19:17 (LXX) linked with Matthew 25:31-46, appear to find their basis in a Jewish-Christian tradition on benefaction rather than in Graeco-Roman euergetism.

On the basis of the current reading of sources, Chrysostom's views appear to be unique to him, both with regard to the Jewish-Christian tradition on gift-giving and the classical thoughts on friendship, in presenting the ultimate benefactor as originally wanting to appear as debtor, a characteristic of a true friend. He desires for his gifts to appear as repayment, as responsive rather than initial gifts. As such, Chrysostom shifts the focus from man's indebtedness over against God or almsgiving as redemptive activity in itself, to God's φιλανθρωπία and more specifically, His pursuit of friendship with man as motivating power for the pursuit of virtue.

Because of Chrysostom's dominant focus on the cultivation of friendship with God, it is the (disposition of) the donor, indicating the existent

⁸³ *hom. in Mt.* 76.5 (PG, 58.700.30-44; NPNF).

⁸⁴ *hom. in Mt.* 45 (PG, 58.474.14-18; NPNF).

friendship, more than either the (need of the) recipient, the alleviation of the poor and the gift element which receives primary emphasis. Redemption is friendship with God, according to Chrysostom, and this friendship is described as an intimate relationship of reciprocal affection. For Chrysostom the use of economic terms of debt, credit and investment does not turn this into a mere formal obligation of services.

Summary

This article presents a systematic analysis of John Chrysostom's concept of God as debtor, which is primarily used in his discourse on almsgiving. On the basis of John's own suggestion, it is proposed that friendship with God is the appropriate interpretative framework for understanding how God can become one's debtor. Chrysostom's idea of friendship with God is explored in relation to his views about merchandise against the background of both Graeco-Roman euergetism and aspects of the Judeo-Christian tradition on gift-giving. It is argued that despite his abundant use of the economic language of lending and banking, Chrysostom's dominant emphasis falls on the cultivation of friendship with God, rather than on almsgiving as a redemptive activity in itself.

Structure and Argument in Augustine's Nativity Sermons 184 and 185: Two Sermons with a Division into Three Parts

Joost VAN NEER

(Eindhoven)

1. Sermones 184 and 185

Sermones 184 (SPM 1, pp. 74-76) and 185 (PL 38, cols. 997-999) are the first two of thirteen *sermones in natali domini nostri Iesu Christi*, or nativity sermons (ss. 184-196),¹ which the Maurists after painstaking research regarded as authentic works of Augustine and which they consequently included in their edition.² It is not known where and when Augustine delivered them.³ Nor is it certain whether the scriptural passages referred to in them correspond to the verses read before the sermons during the liturgical celebrations.⁴

¹ For a modern classification of Augustine's sermons see H.R. DROBNER, *Augustinus von Hippo, Sermones ad populum, Überlieferung & Bestand, Bibliographie, Indices*, Leiden, 2000. See also H.R. DROBNER, *Augustinus von Hippo, Sermones ad populum, Überlieferung und Bestand – Bibliographie – Indices: Supplement 2000-2010*, Frankfurt, 2010. For a modern translation of Augustine's nativity sermons into the English language see E. HILL, *Sermons III/6 (184-229Z) on the Liturgical Seasons*, New York, 1993.

² (Opera et Studio Monachorum Ordinis Sancti Benedicti e Congregatione Sancti Mauri) *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Operum Tomus Quintus continens Sermones ad Populum*, Paris 1683, col. 881-883 (s. 184), and col. 883-884 (s. 185).

³ See H.R. DROBNER, *Augustinus von Hippo, Predigten zum Weihnachtsfest (Sermones 184-196), Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Frankfurt, 2003, p. 90 (for s. 184), and p. 107 (for s. 185). See also H.R. DROBNER, "The Chronology of Augustine's Sermones ad populum III: On Christmas Day", *Augustinian Studies*, 35 (2004), pp. 43-53.

⁴ For a study of the scriptural passages quoted in Augustine's sermons, see M. MARGONI-KÖGLER, *Die Perikopen im Gottesdienst bei Augustinus. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der liturgischen Schriftlesung in der frühen Kirche*, Wien, 2011. For the nativity sermons see pp. 49-70.

2. Enquiring into the Structure of *Sermones* 184 and 185

a. *Gaining Access to the Sermons*

The aim of our enquiry is to show that *sermones* 184 and 185 are well-structured and well-considered texts.⁵ Scholars previously believed that Augustine gave little attention to the form of his sermons, and they consequently concentrated mainly on (aspects of) the contents.⁶ More recent scholarship has repudiated this view and has recognised that it is necessary to comprehend the form of Augustine's sermons in order to better understand their content.⁷ This article hopes to contribute to the ongoing debate about the presence or absence of structure in Augustine's sermons and its consequences for the message contained in them.⁸ It will do this for *sermones* 184 and 185 by identifying the key to what Kolbet has called their "hidden' psychagogic form".⁹ This requires a detailed analysis of the structure and argument of both texts.¹⁰

⁵ This enquiry forms part of a larger enquiry into structure and argument of Augustine's nativity sermons.

⁶ See for instance F. VAN DER MEER, *Augustine the Bishop, The Life and Work of a Father of the Church*, London, (1961) 1983, p. 419: "The planning that was inculcated by the schools is completely absent"; p. 419-420: "Augustine disregarded any need for logical construction and observed only that order which was dictated by circumstances and by his own heart". See also P. BROWN, *Augustine of Hippo, A Biography*, London, 1967, p. 256: "(...), for the speaker's style was not thought of as a harmonious assemblage of prefabricated parts, which the connoisseur might take to pieces, but rather as the inseparable welding of form and content in the heat of the message".

⁷ See for instance L. MECHLINSKY, *Der modus proferendi in Augustinus' sermones ad populum*, Paderborn, 2004, p. 259: "Obwohl alle vier Predigten [ss. 12, 266, 240 und 181 (JvN)] unerhörbare Merkmale der Mündlichkeit aufweisen und anscheinend nicht schriftlich vorbereitet wurden, scheint in jedem Fall eine geplante Disposition konsequent umgesetzt zu werden".

⁸ For a recent example of this debate see H. MÜLLER, "Preacher: Augustine and His Congregation", in *A Companion to Augustine* – ed. M. VESSEY, Chichester, 2012, p. 306: "It is hard to summarize an Augustinian sermon. Its content seems to be in constant flux from one subject matter to another".

⁹ See P.R. KOLBET, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls, Revising a Classical Ideal*, Notre Dame, Indiana, 2010, p. 208: "Making explicit the 'hidden' psychagogic form that makes necessary the details of the sermons, constitutes at least a beginning to assessing the homily as a discrete task with its own explicit criteria for effectiveness. (...), awareness of psychagogic methods is especially important for understanding the dynamic interaction between preacher and audience". For a description of this premise see J. VAN NEER, "Scripture as the Structuring Principle in *Sermones* 295 and 299B", in *Tractatio Scripturarum, Philological, Exegetical, Rhetorical and Theological Studies on Augustine's Sermons (Ministerium Sermonis II)* – ed. A. DUPONT – G. PARTOENS – M. LAMBERIGTS, Turnhout, 2012, pp. 223-244.

¹⁰ For a detailed rhetorical-theological analysis of a part of s. 184,1 see P.-M. HOMBERT, *La prédication sur le Verbe incarné dans les sermons d'Augustin pour Noël et l'Ascension. Rhétorique et théologie*, in: DUPONT – PARTOENS – LAMBERIGTS, 2012, blz. 271-333. Hombert

b. *A Double Key: Language and Scripture*

In an earlier article we used an analysis of linguistic signals and the use of scriptural quotes and/or allusions to show that *sermones* 186 and 187 are carefully structured and considered texts, having a four-part structure, according to doctr.chr. 4,2,3 and 4,4,6.¹¹

Since it proved possible there to recover the structure of the sermons on the basis of their use of language and of Scripture, it is reasonable to assume that we can use the same method to identify the structure of *sermones* 184 and 185. This method involves two kinds of analysis that must be carried out side by side and that mutually support each other. Any attempt to identify transitions merely on the basis of linguistics would be difficult, because linguistic markers do not occur only at transitions between the different parts of the text (henceforth called 'heavy markers') but naturally also at transitions between segments within those parts (henceforth called 'light markers') and indeed at transitions between elements within the segments.¹² In order to determine which markers are heavy markers and which are light markers, it will be necessary to study the use of Scripture, which connects the different segments within each part and makes these parts internally coherent and well-rounded units. The study of the use of Scripture reveals that there is coherence between the segments, and thus helps to show that different segments have produced a single, coherent part, just as the different parts have produced a single, coherent sermon.¹³

An enquiry into transitions in the sermons through an analysis of the use of Scripture and of linguistic signals, will, it is hoped, demonstrate that *sermones* 184 and 185 consist of three internally coherent and well-rounded parts, and will disclose the reason for this division. It will become apparent that the message of the two sermons will be presented adequately and efficiently if this division is adopted.

3. *The Structure of Sermones 184 and 185. An Analysis*

a. *Sermo 184*

At the beginning of s. 184 Augustine juxtaposes the believers and the unbelievers on the basis of Matt. 11, 25c-d. The believers (the Christians)

unfortunately addressed neither the rest of s. 184,1, nor s. 184,2-3, nor s. 185. As will be shown in this article, the part of s. 184,1 which Hombert discusses is not the *exordium* (pp. 275-276), but forms part of the didactic moment of s. 184, which contains elements of an *exordium*.

¹¹ See J. VAN NEER, "Language and scripture as structuring principles of Augustine's sermones 186 and 187", *Augustiniana* (in press).

¹² For a description of the method see VAN NEER, in press.

¹³ For a description of the method see VAN NEER 2012 and in press.

are receptive to grace on account of their humility, whereas the unbelievers (in this sermon: the pagans) are not on account of their pride. In the middle part, he clarifies and recommends the role played in the Church by Christ, who is God outside time and man within time. At the conclusion of the sermon, Augustine elaborates on the notion of grace.

A First Part

A First Segment

Augustine begins s. 184 with a statement concerning the nativity of Christ: *Natalis [dies] domini et saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi, quo ueritas de terra orta est, et dies ex die in nostrum natus est diem, anniuersario reditu nobis hodie celebrandus illuxit.*

Two relative clauses that provide information about the nativity (*natalis [dies]*) lie at the core of this statement. Both clauses are based on scriptural passages. The first clause, *quo ueritas de terra orta est*, is based on Ps. 84 (85), 12a (*ueritas de terra orta est*), a text which Augustine sometimes uses in connection with the birth of God as man.¹⁴ The element *ueritas* represents Christ's divinity, the element *de terra orta est* his humanity. In the second clause, *et dies ex die in nostrum natus est diem*, the element *dies ex die* represents Christ's divinity, the element *in nostrum natus est diem* his humanity. Augustine turned to Ps. 95 (96), 2b (*annuntiate diem ex die salutare eius*) for *dies ex die*. He interprets this text in a peculiar way, transforming the adverbial clause *diem ex die* (from day to day) into the direct object *diem ex die* (day coming forth from day).¹⁵ The phrase – which is reminiscent of a formula in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed (*Deum de Deo (God from God)*)¹⁶ – refers to God coming forth from God.¹⁷

¹⁴ Cf. for instance s. 185,1: *Veritas, quae est in sinu patris, de terra orta est, ut esset etiam in sinu matris. Veritas, qua mundus continetur, de terra orta est, ut femineis manibus portaretur. Veritas, qua beatitudo angelorum incorruptibiliter alitur, de terra orta est, ut carnalibus uberibus lactaretur. Veritas, cui caelum non sufficit, de terra orta est, ut in praeseptum poneretur.*

¹⁵ The King James Bible translates Ps. 95 (96), 2b as: *Shew forth his salvation from day to day.*

¹⁶ For the role of the Creed in Augustine's nativity sermons see DROBNER 2003, pp. 46-53. See also H.R. DROBNER, "Christmas in Hippo: Mystical Celebration and Catechesis", *Augustinian Studies* 35,1 (2004), pp. 63-71.

¹⁷ Cf. s. 190,4: *Dies filius ex die patre, Deus ex Deo, lumen ex lumine.* The notion of *dies de/ex die* is found also outside the nativity sermons, for instance in the Easter sermons s. 226: *Agnosimus Verbum Deum apud Deum, agnoscimus patri aequalem unigenitum filium, agnoscimus lumen de lumine, diem ex die. Ipse est dies, qui fecit diem: a die non factus, sed genitus*, and s. 229L, 2: *Ille coaeternus, patri aequalis, sine tempore, ante omnia tempora, per quem facta sunt tempora: ante diem, dies de die, qui condidit diem.*

Although Augustine does not quote Ps. 117 (118), 24a (*haec est dies, quam fecit dominus*) directly, his statement is based on it, or at least alludes to it.¹⁸ The connection lies in the idea that the day, which can be equated with ‘God coming forth from God’ according to the second relative clause, has become light, or has dawned (*illuxit*), exactly as Ps. 117 (118), 27a describes it (*Deus dominus et illuxit nobis*).¹⁹ This does not however exhaust the use Augustine makes of this Psalm. With the gerundive *celebrandus* Augustine anticipates the two exhortations he will make in a following segment that are derived from Ps. 117 (118), 24b (*exsultemus et laetemur in ea*).²⁰

A Second Segment

Augustine then continues with the exhortations derived from Ps. 117 (118), 24b which was mentioned above: *Exsultemus et iucundemur in eo*.

Both exhortations are immediately followed by their motive. Augustine wants to make clear why the audience should be elated and should rejoice on account of the nativity of Christ. The reason turns out to be because Christians know something through their faith which unbelievers – as a result of their unbelief – do not know. He explains this ‘something’ in an indirect question: *Quid enim nobis praestiterit tantae sublimitatis humilitas*, which functions as an object to *fides habet christianorum*, and as a subject to *remotum est a cordibus impiorum*. Augustine refers to Christ’s divinity with *tantae sublimitatis* and to his humanity with *humilitas*, the beneficiaries being described as *nobis*.²¹ The consensus particle *enim*, used by Augustine to indicate that he is appealing to his audience for their consent to his explanation, adds to the conspiratorial atmosphere he creates here: his listeners know something that the unbelievers do not know. The answer to the question why his listeners know lies in their faith: *fides habet christianorum*; the answer to the question why the unbelievers do not know (*remotum est a cordibus impiorum*), lies in a decree from God: *quoniam*

¹⁸ See A.A.R. BASTIAENSEN, “‘The Day which the Lord has made’ (Psalm 117:24a) in Patristic Exegesis”, in *Ultima Aetas, Time, Tense and Transience in the Ancient World, Studies in Honour of Jan den Boeft* – ed. C. KROON – D. DEN HENGST, Amsterdam, 2000, pp. 147-162.

¹⁹ Cf. s. 196,1: *Hodiernus dies natalis domini nostri Iesu Christi nobis festus illuxit*.

²⁰ For the gerundive see R. KÜHNER – C. STEGMANN, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache*, Hannover, II. Satzlehre, I. Teil, 1912, pp. 729-730. P. 729: “Das (...) Gerundivum (...) drückt die Notwendigkeit, den Begriff des Müssens (im Sinne von oportet, opus est, necesse est oder debeo) aus. Die Person, die etwas tun soll oder muss, steht dabei im Dativ”.

²¹ Cf. s. 185,1: *Cuius bono in tanta humilitate uenit tanta sublimitas? Nullo utique suo, sed magno, si credimus, nostro*.

abscondit Deus haec a sapientibus et prudentibus, et reuelavit ea paruulis. This explanation is derived from Matth. 11, 25 (c *qui abscondisti haec a sapientibus et prudentibus*, d *et reuelasti paruulis*), where Jesus, filled with gratitude, addresses his Father.²² The use of an active predicate (*habet*) in *fides habet christianorum*, and a passive predicate (*remotum est*) in *remotum est a cordibus impiorum* is significant. It signifies a contrast between the mobility of the Christians and the immobility of the unbelievers, which is the result of the former's belief in God and God's decree respectively. Passive predicates are fairly rare in Augustine's sermons. Whenever they are used, they are usually intended to emphasise something. In this case, the emphasis is on the desperate situation in which unbelievers find themselves.²³ For, although the agent (the acting party) is not expressly named, his identity can be deduced from the scriptural reference: God. He is the one who has hidden these things from the wise and prudent.

After he has motivated the exhortations *Exsultemus* and *iucundemur* by introducing the notion of the mobility of the Christians as opposed to the immobility of the unbelievers, and after it has become clear that Christians have reason to act upon their mobility, Augustine concludes the first part. He does so with a tightly structured passage where he returns to the contrast between Christians and unbelievers which he has just introduced and which strengthens the conspiratorial atmosphere he has created. The two groups are twice separated from and connected with one another through the particle *autem*. The particle *ergo* at the beginning of the concluding segment indicates that Augustine is now compelling his audience to consent, and no longer simply asking for consent, as he was in the motivating *enim*-sentence: in his eyes it is no longer a matter of free choice.

The passage consists of two exhortations with subjunctive predicates addressed to the Christians, who are now initially called *humiles* instead

²² For a modern interpretation of Matth. 11, 25c-d see W.D. DAVIES, D.C. ALLISON, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*, Edinburgh (1991) 2001 (The international critical commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments), pp. 275-276: "(...). Revelation, it follows, is necessarily hid from self-seeking savants and the vain exemplars of worldly reason, of however a devout demeanour. The doors to true wisdom remain closed to them. While knowledge, like wealth, 'puffs up' (I Cor. 8, 1), the quest for God requires the annihilation of all pride. And in any case, 'if you understand it, it is not God' (Augustine). So strength of mind does not wrest spiritual blessings. In God's presence one must not only be humble of heart but lowly of mind. Divine truths are, therefore, revealed only to 'babes', that is, to the truly meek and humble".

²³ For active and passive see H. PINKSTER, "Het Latijnse passief", *Lampas* 17 (1984), p. 429: "(...) dat de keuze tussen actief en passief afhangt van het perspectief dat de schrijver (spreker) kiest om de gebeurtenissen in een zin weer te geven". See also R. RISSELADA, "Passive, perspective and textual cohesion", in *New Studies in Latin Linguistics, Selected papers from the 4th International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics* – ed. R. COLEMAN, Cambridge, 1987, pp. 401-414.

of – and by way of explanation of – the term *paruuli* used before: 1 *Teneant ergo humiles humilitatem Dei*, (...). They are subsequently designated as *nobis*: 1a *Nobis autem, quanto (...), tanto sit gratius (...), et quanto (...), tanto sit diuinior (...)*. In a final clause of the first exhortation Augustine succinctly elaborates on the idea of the mobility of Christians: *ut in hoc adiumento* (i.e. the *humilitas Dei*), *tamquam in infirmitatis suae iumento, perueniant ad altitudinem Dei*. Augustine here uses the image of Christians relying on God's humility as if it were a beast of burden in order to ascend to God. This is undoubtedly a reference to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Matth. 21, 1-11). The second exhortation contains no images: *Nobis (...), (tanto sit gratius) in humilitate Dei hominis corpus*, and: (...), *(tanto sit diuinior) in hominis natiuitate uirginis partus*.

The two exhortations addressed to the Christians enclose two statements with indicative predicates about the unbelievers, who are initially called *sapientes et prudentes*: 2 *Sapientes et prudentes, (...), (pependerunt)*, and thereafter *illi*: 2a *Hoc tam grande miraculum malunt illi fictum putare quam factum*. The first statement also uses a subordinate clause – but not a final one – to elaborate on the idea of the immobility of the unbelievers: *dum alta Dei quaerunt, et humilia non credunt, ista* (i.e. the *humilia (Dei)*) *praetermittentes, et propter hoc nec ad illa* (i.e. the *alta Dei*) *peruenientes, inanes et leues, inflati et elati, tamquam inter caelum et terram in uentoso medio pependerunt*. Here Augustine also uses an image, that of the unbelievers who are unable to ascend, denying as they do God's humility, and who are therefore unable to rely on it as their beast of burden. This causes them to remain suspended between heaven and earth: they cannot complete the movement on their own. The second statement contains no images: *Ita in Christo, homine et Deo, credere quoniam non possunt, humana contemnunt, quoniam non possunt contemnere, diuina non credunt*.

In between these pairs of highly stylised exhortations and statements which are illustrated by images and followed by practical information, Augustine explains why the unbelievers are immobile (and the Christians, conversely, are not): 3 *Sunt enim sapientes et prudentes* (a reference to Matth. 11, 25), *sed huius mundi, non illius, a quo factus est mundus*. As is clear from the presence of the consensus particle *enim*, Augustine trusts that his audience will understand him and agree with him: the unbelievers are unable to advance because they focus on creation rather than on the creator.

An Explanation

In a *nam*-element Augustine now explains retrospectively why the *sapientes et prudentes* are so unfortunate: they lack the *uera sapientia, quae Dei est et Deus est* (a reference to I Cor. 1, 24b: *Christum Dei uirtutem et*

Dei sapientiam) which the *humiles* have. In doing so he indirectly explains why the latter possess mobility.

He starts with an *irrealis*, focusing on the problem of the unbelievers (and the good fortune of the Christians). The conditional clause in which the unreal condition is expressed: *si esset in eis uera sapientia, quae Dei est et Deus est*, is followed by two repeating principal clauses, both beginning with *intellegerent*. In both cases, this verb is followed by an accusative and infinitive construction evoking the paradox of Christ's divinity and humanity. The profession of faith underlies the paradox of Christ. The element as a whole can be construed as an explicit representation of the fact that Christians partake of salvation, but at the same time also as an implicit exhortation to the unbelievers.

Subsequently, Augustine corroborates the foregoing by stating that the same Christ who, as God (*apud patrem manentis*), is responsible for the creation of the world, is also responsible, as man (*ad nos uenientis*), for the motherhood of a virgin.

Finally he uses the paradox of Mary's virginity and motherhood as a confirmation of the paradox of Christ's divinity and humanity. In other words: the paradox of Christ is made accessible by the paradox of Mary. The paradox of Mary is based on Is. 7, 14b (*ecce, uirgo concipiet et pariet filium*), or, more probably, on one of the gospel stories that incorporate this text (Matth. 1, 23a or Luc. 1, 31a), which emphasise the absence of the involvement of a man (*et non cognoscebat eam, donec peperit filium suum primogenitum* (Matth. 1, 25a), and *quomodo fiet istud, quoniam uirum non cognosco?* (Luc. 1, 34b)). The connection is made explicit by the particle *quippe*.

See the table below:

	An explanation (<i>nam</i>)
1	Explicit statement and implicit exhortation
	<i>Nam si esset in eis uera sapientia, quae Dei est, et Deus est,</i> 1 <i>intellegerent, (...),</i> 2 <i>intellegerent, (...).</i>
2	Motivation
	1 <i>Cuius opus est – apud patrem manentis – mundus uniuersus,</i>
	2 <i>huius opus est – ad nos uenientis – uirginis partus.</i>
3	Corroboration
	<i>Dedit quippe indicium maiestatis eius uirgo mater, (...).</i>

The First Part of s. 184: a Coherent Whole

The first part is, therefore, a coherent whole, in which Augustine does two things. First, he indicates that God was born as man. Second, he exhorts his audience to be elated and rejoice. In his motivation of these exhortations Augustine connects Christ's divinity with sublimity (*sublimitas*), and his humanity with humility (*humilitas*). In addition, he posits that Christians accept this humility while the unbelievers do not. It can be inferred from this that the latter are proud. This leads him to two exhortations addressed to the Christians, juxtaposed with statements about the unbelievers.

Schematically, the first part looks like this:

S. 184, part 1											
1	Statement with an implicit exhortation to celebrate										
	<i>Natalis domini et saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi,</i> <i>(...),</i> <i>anniuersario reditu nobis hodie celebrandus illuxit.</i>										
2	Exhortations to rejoice										
1	Exhortations										
	<i>Exsultemus et iucundemur in eo.</i>										
2	Motivations for the exhortations										
	<i>Quid enim nobis praestiterit tantae sublimitatis humilitas,</i> <i>fides habet christianorum,</i> <i>remotum est a cordibus impiorum,</i> <i>quoniam abscondit Deus haec a sapientibus et prudentibus et reuelauit ea</i> <i>paruulis.</i>										
3	Conclusion										
	<table><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td><i>Teneant ergo humiles humilitatem Dei, (...).</i></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td><i>Sapientes autem et prudentes, (...), tamquam inter caelum et terram</i> <i>in uentoso medio pependerunt.</i></td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td></tr></table>			1	<i>Teneant ergo humiles humilitatem Dei, (...).</i>			2	<i>Sapientes autem et prudentes, (...), tamquam inter caelum et terram</i> <i>in uentoso medio pependerunt.</i>		
1	<i>Teneant ergo humiles humilitatem Dei, (...).</i>										
2	<i>Sapientes autem et prudentes, (...), tamquam inter caelum et terram</i> <i>in uentoso medio pependerunt.</i>										

		3	<i>Sunt enim sapientes et prudentes, sed huius mundi, non illius a quo factus est mundus.</i> An explanation (see the table above) <i>Nam si esset (...).</i>
		2a	<i>Hoc tam grande miraculum malunt illi fictum putare quam factum.</i>
		1a	<i>Nobis autem, quanto (...), tanto sit gratius (...), et [nobis] quanto (...), tanto sit diuinior (...).</i>

A Second Part

A First Segment

Having made his fellow humans aware of what they have to do to benefit from the birth of God as man, Augustine now goes one step further. It is apparent that a new part begins here – with a heavy marker – not only from the conclusion of the first part with its symmetrically constructed third segment, but also from the use of the adverb *proinde* (therefore, accordingly).²⁴ This indicates that the explanation of what follows can be found in the preceding section. Augustine gives an exhortation, thereby starting the sermon afresh. He urges his audience to celebrate the nativity of the Lord: *Proinde natalem domini frequentia et festiuitate debita celebremus*. This utterance contains two references to the beginning of the first part, *natali domini* and *celebremus*. Augustine repeats the *Natalis domini et saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi* of the first part in a condensed form with *natalem domini*, the referent still being sufficiently active to allow him to do so.²⁵ With *celebremus* he takes up the gerundive *celebrandus* of the first part, used there to point his audience to the exhortations of Ps. 117 (118), 24b (*Exsultemus et laetemur in ea*). There is no trace here, however, of the other Psalm references, all of which have been replaced by the adverbial phrase *frequentia [debita] et festiuitate debita*,

²⁴ See A. ERNOUT – A. MEILLET, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue Latine, Histoire des mots*, Paris, 1951, p. 952 (on *proinde*): “De là en allant plus loin, par suite, par conséquent”.

²⁵ See H. PANDER MAAT, *Tekstanalyse. Wat teksten tot teksten maakt*, Bussum, 2002, p. 55.

which is perhaps based on Ps. 117 (118), 27b (*constituite diem sollemnem in condensis*).²⁶

A Second Segment

The phrase *frequentia et festiuitate debita* introduces a repeating element, initially consisting of exhortations, thereafter of commands, addressed to the different groups into which Christians can be divided and which consequently make up the Church. These exhortations and commands all contain the verb *exsultare*,²⁷ in an un mistakeable reference to the two exhortations based on Ps. 117 (118), 24b in the first part: *Exsultemus et laetemur in ea*. Augustine only addresses exhortations with subjunctive predicates to the first group; to all other groups he addresses commands with imperative predicates. There are nine groups in total, the first (*uiri* and *feminae*) and the last (*omnes christiani*) comprising the whole group, the other seven being subgroups.

Augustine provides motives for each exhortation and command, again in a repeating element. In each case Augustine uses aspects of Christ that correspond to the group in question. In the case of the first two groups (*uiri* and *feminae* and *pueri sancti*) the motivations are followed by elaborations which correlate to the nature of the group involved. In the case of the *uiri* and *feminae*, this elaboration is based on the story of the Fall (Gen. 3, 1-6), the argument being that the sin committed there by man (the first Adam (see I Cor. 15, 45-49)) and woman has been annulled by Christ (the second Adam) and Mary.²⁸ The elaboration under *pueri sancti* is original to Augustine.

See the tables below:

	Elaboration of the motivation of the first exhortation (<i>uiri</i> and <i>feminae</i>)
1	Corroborative statements
	1 <i>Christus uir est natus,</i> 2 <i>ex femina est natus,</i> 3 <i>et uterque sexus est honoratus</i>

²⁶ Cf. s. 196,1: *Hodiernus dies natalis domini nostri Iesu Christi nobis festus illuxit.*

²⁷ Cf. s. 192,2: *Exsultate, uirgines Christi, (...). Exsultate, uiduae Christi, (...). Exsultate etiam, castitas nuptialis, omnes fideliter uiuentes cum coniugibus uestris, (...).*

²⁸ Augustine uses the same thought to refute Manichaean ideas in s. 12,12.

2	Confirmation of the statements in reverse order
	<p>1 <i>Iam ergo ad secundum hominem transeat,</i> <i>qui in primo fuerat ante damnatus.</i></p> <p>2 <i>Mortem nobis persuaserat femina,</i> <i>Vitam nobis peperit femina.</i></p> <p>3 <i>Nata est similitudo carnis peccati,</i> <i>qua mundaretur caro peccati.</i></p>
3	Conclusion
	<i>Non itaque caro culpetur, sed, ut natura uiuat, culpa moriatur,</i> <i>quia sine culpa natus est, in quo is, qui in culpa fuerat, renascatur.</i>

	Elaboration of the motivation of the second exhortation (<i>pueri sancti</i>)
1	Corroborative statement
	<i>Non ad uos per coniugium uenit, quem sequendum inuenistis,</i> <i>ut donaret uobis contemnere per quod uenistis.</i>
2	Explanation of the statement
	<p>1 <i>Vos enim uenistis per carnales nuptias,</i> <i>sine quibus ille spirituales uenit ad nuptias.</i></p> <p>2 <i>Et uobis dedit spernere nuptias,</i> <i>quos praecipue uocauit ad nuptias.</i></p>
3	Conclusion
	<i>Ergo unde nati estis, non quaesistis,</i> <i>quia eum, qui non ita natus est, plus quam ceteri dilexistis.</i>

A Third Segment

After the exhortations/commands Augustine concludes with a complex of paradoxes in which he invokes Christ's twofold nature and birth in a poetic fashion. According to this section, neither of his two natures (God and man) and births (*de patre* (God) and *de matre* (Mary)) is comprehensible to human beings. What really matters, however, is the outcome of these events, as Augustine explains by referring to Is. 53, 8b (*Generationem eius quis enarrabit?*).²⁹

²⁹ Cf. s. 195,2 and s. 196,2, where Augustine uses Is. 53, 8b as starting point for a description of Christ's two natures and births.

The Second Part of s. 184: a Coherent Whole

The second part is, therefore, a coherent whole, in which Augustine does three things. First, he encourages his audience to celebrate the nativity of Christ. Second, he exhorts/commands his listeners, addressed per group, to rejoice. By way of corroboration, Augustine links all subgroups to appropriate aspects of Christ. Third, he concludes with a poetical evocation of Christ's twofold nature and birth.

Schematically, the second part looks like this:

S. 184, part 2		
1	Exhortation to celebrate	
<i>Proinde natalem domini frequentia et festiuitate debita celebremus.</i>		
2		
1	Exhortations/commands to rejoice	
	<div>1 <i>Exsultent uiri, exsultent feminae.</i></div> <div>2 <i>Exsultate, pueri sancti,</i> <i>qui Christum praecipue sequendum elegistis,</i> <i>qui coniugia non quaesistis.</i></div> <div>3 <i>Exsultate, uirgines sanctae.</i></div> <div>4 <i>Exsultate, iusti.</i></div> <div>5 <i>Exsultate, debiles et aegroti.</i></div> <div>6 <i>Exsultate, captiui.</i></div> <div>7 <i>Exsultate, serui.</i></div> <div>8 <i>Exsultate, liberi.</i></div> <div>9 <i>Exsultate, omnes christiani.</i></div>	
2	Corroboration	
	<div>1 <i>Christus uir est natus,</i> <i>ex femina est natus,</i> <i>et uterque sexus est honoratus.</i></div> <div>Elaboration of the motivation (see the first table above)</div> <div><i>Iam ergo ad secundum hominem transeat,</i> <i>(...).</i></div> <div>2 <i>Non ad uos per coniugium uenit, quam sequendum inuenistis,</i> <i>ut donaret uobis contmenere per quod uenistis.</i></div> <div>Elaboration of the motivation (see the second table above)</div> <div><i>Vos enim uenistis per carnales nuptias,</i> <i>(...).</i></div> <div>3 <i>Virgo uobis peperit, cui sine corruptione nubatis,</i> <i>quae nec concipiendo, nec pariendo potestis perdere quod amatis.</i></div>	

		4 <i>Natalis est iustificatoris.</i> 5 <i>Natalis est saluatoris.</i> 6 <i>Natalis est redemptoris.</i> 7 <i>Natalis est dominantis.</i> 8 <i>Natalis est liberantis.</i> 9 <i>Natalis est Christi.</i>
3	Concluding paradox	
	1	1 <i>Hic de matre natus istum diem saeculis commendauit,</i> <i>qui de patre natus saecula cuncta creauit.</i> 2 <i>Nec illa natiuitas ullam habere potuit matrem,</i> <i>nec ista quaesiuit hominem patrem.</i>
	2	<i>Denique natus est Christus</i> <i>et de patre, et de matre,</i> <i>et sine patre, et sine matre,</i> <i>de patre Deus, de matre homo,</i> <i>sine matre Deus, sine patre homo.</i>
	3	<i>Generationem ergo eius quis enarrabit,</i> <i>siue illam sine tempore, siue istam sine semine,</i> <i>illam sine initio, istam sine exemplo,</i> <i>illam, quae numquam non fuit, istam, quae nec antea, nec postea fuit,</i> <i>illam, quae non habet finem, istam, quae initium illic habet, ubi finem?</i>

A Third Part

A First Segment

Now that it has become clear that Christians are right to cling humbly to the God born as man, who is Christ – implying that the unbelievers are failing to do so on account of their pride – Augustine is ready to conclude the sermon. There is a heavy marker here: having concluded the second part with the rhetorical question based on Is. 53, 8b, Augustine begins the third part with the double statement – placed in a parallel manner – saying that the prophets were right (*merito*) to foretell the approaching birth of Christ, and the heavens and the angels to proclaim his birth: *Merito ergo prophetae nuntiauerunt nasciturum, caeli uero atque angeli natum*. The change of subject marks the transition from the second to the third part, as does the particle *ergo*. Taking for granted that his listeners cannot but

agree with him, Augustine uses *ergo*, as it were, to compel them to consent. Augustine's mention of the *prophetae* who foretold the birth of Christ is a reference to Isaiah, from whom the rhetorical question which Augustine just used is derived (Is. 53, 8b), and who prophesied in Is. 7, 14b that a virgin would conceive and bear a son (*ecce, uirgo concipiet et pariet filium*). This prophecy was included by both Matthew and Luke in their respective nativity stories (Matth. 1, 23a and Luc. 1, 31a). *Caeli* refers to the story of the announcement to the Magi through the guiding star (Matth. 2, 1-12), while *angeli* refers to the story of the proclamation to the shepherds by an angel, subsequently joined by a multitude of angels (Luc. 2, 8-20). The two statements confirm one another. The prophecy made in the Old Testament has, therefore, been fulfilled in the New Testament.³⁰

A Second Segment

Augustine next addresses the fulfilment of the prophecy in God's birth as man. He does this in a segment that is conspicuous for its large number of imperfect predicates. It thus forms a single whole which not only stands out from the previous segment, where the predicates are in another tense (the perfect), but also from the next segment, where the predicates are in another mood (the subjunctive). The imperfect tense is traditionally used for descriptions, and this is also the way in which Augustine uses it here. Through references to a large number of scriptural verses, Augustine endeavours to show that Christ's divinity and humanity converge through God's birth as man.

Thus in this segment Augustine connects Christ's humanity and divinity. Mary serves as the point of connection.³¹ Augustine therefore places her at the heart of the segment (element 2) in her relationship to Christ, as the one whose womb bore Christ, who looked after him when he was a child and in whom, notwithstanding her weakness and humility, Christ's divinity was hidden: 2.1 *Quem caeli non capiunt* (Christ (cf. II Par. 6, 18b)), *unius feminae sinus ferebat* (Mary (cf. Luc. 11, 27c)), 2.2 *illa* (Mary) *regem nostrum* (Christ (cf. Matth. 2, 2c)) *regebat, in quo sumus* (Christ (cf. Act. 17, 28a)), *illa* (Mary) *portabat, panem nostrum* (Christ (cf. Ioh. 6, 48)) *illa* (Mary) *lactabat*, 2.3 *O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas* (Mary), *in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas* (Christ (cf. I Cor. 2, 7a)).

³⁰ Cf. s. 300,3: *Testamentum enim Vetus uelatio est noui Testamenti, et Testamentum nouum reuelatio est Veteris Testamenti.*

³¹ Cf. s. 195,3: (...), *manens in sinu patris, impleuit uterum matris. In quo thalamo, id est: uirginis utero, natura diuina sibi copulauit humanam.*

The element in which the mother occupies the central place is surrounded by actions of Christ, God and man: preceding the element about the mother (element 1): 1.1 *Iacebat in praeseptio* (as man (cf. Luc. 2, 7c.12b.16c)) *continens mundum* (as God), 1.2 *et infans erat* (as man (cf. Luc. 2, 12b.16c)) *et Verbum* (as God); following the element about the mother (element 3): 3.1 *Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia* (as man (cf. Luc. 2, 51b)), *regebat potentia* (as God), 3.2 *et cuius ubera sugebat* (as man (cf. Luc. 11, 27c)), *eam ueritate pascebat* (as God). These actions demonstrate both contrast and parallelism: in both elements Augustine contrasts Christ's humanity twice with his divinity.

A Third Segment

Now that the birth of God as man has been sufficiently illustrated, Augustine utters two wishes (with subjunctive predicates): *Perficiat in nobis sua munera, qui sumere non abhorruit etiam nostra primordia, et ipse faciat nos Dei filios, qui propter nos fieri uoluit hominis filius*. Both wishes are placed parallel to each other like the two statements of the first segment, and both express the same message. This message is based on the idea that the birth of God as man is the beginning of the gift of grace, which must still be completed in the future. Augustine here envisages a reversal: as God has become man, so men will become like God.³² The two wishes simultaneously form the conclusion of the sermon.

The Third Part of s. 184: a Coherent Whole

Thus the third part, too, is a coherent whole, in which Augustine does three things. First, he determines that the prophets were right in foretelling that God would be born as man, and the heavens and angels in proclaiming his birth. The heavens and the angels pointed the Magi and the shepherds to the place where they could find the incarnate God. Second, Augustine interprets the scene which the Magi and shepherds encountered upon arriving in the place to which the heavens and the angels directed them. In doing this, Augustine emphasises Christ's humanity without losing sight of his divinity. He affords a central role – both functionally and formally – in this interpretation to the woman in whom divinity and humanity were united. Third, in two utterances Augustine expresses the wish that the gift of grace

³² See for man being (like) God A. BIZZOZERO, *Il mistero pasquale di Gesù Cristo e l'esistenza credente nei sermones di Agostino*, Frankfurt am Main, 2010, pp. 379-387.

to mankind, which, as has become clear, consists of God's incarnation, will be completed in the future. The second segment provides the background to these two parallel statements and two parallel wishes, which enclose it.

Schematically, the second part looks like this:

	S. 184, part 3																												
1	Statements																												
	<i>Merito ergo prophetae nuntiauerunt nasciturum, caeli uero atque angeli natum.</i>																												
2	Confirmation of the statements/introduction to the wishes																												
	<table><tr><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>1 Christ, God and man</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><table><tr><td>1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i></td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr><tr><td>2 The mother</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><table><tr><td>1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i></td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr><tr><td>3 Christ, God and man</td><td></td></tr><tr><td colspan="2"><table><tr><td>1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i></td><td></td></tr></table></td></tr></table>			1 Christ, God and man		<table><tr><td>1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i>		2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i>		2 The mother		<table><tr><td>1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i>		2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i>		3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i>		3 Christ, God and man		<table><tr><td>1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i>		2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i>	
1 Christ, God and man																													
<table><tr><td>1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i>		2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i>																									
1 <i>Iacebat in praesepio continens mundum;</i>																													
2 <i>et infans erat et Verbum.</i>																													
2 The mother																													
<table><tr><td>1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i>		2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i>		3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i>																							
1 <i>Quem caeli non capiunt, unius feminae sinus ferebat.</i>																													
2 <i>Illam regem nostrum regebat, in quo sumus, illa portaba, panem nostrum illa lactabat.</i>																													
3 <i>O manifesta infirmitas et mira humilitas, in qua sic latuit tota diuinitas!</i>																													
3 Christ, God and man																													
<table><tr><td>1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i></td><td></td></tr></table>		1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i>		2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i>																									
1 <i>Matrem, cui subiacebat infantia, regebat potentia;</i>																													
2 <i>et cuius ubera sugebat, eam ueritate pascebat.</i>																													
3	Wishes																												
	<i>Perficiat in nobis sua munera, qui sumere non abhorruit etiam nostra primordia, et ipse faciat nos Dei filios, qui propter nos fieri uoluit hominis filius.</i>																												

b. Sermo 185

At the beginning of s. 185 Augustine clarifies and recommends the role played in the Church by Christ, who is God outside time and man within time. In the middle part, he juxtaposes the believers and the unbelievers on the basis of I Cor. 1, 30b-31 and Rom. 10, 30. The believers (the Christians) are receptive to grace on account of their humility, whereas the unbelievers (in this sermon: the Jews) are not on account of their pride. At the conclusion of the sermon, Augustine elaborates on the notion of grace.

*A First Part**A First Segment*

Augustine begins s. 185 with a statement concerning the nativity of Christ: *Natalis domini dicitur*, which he develops with two temporal clauses: *quando Dei sapientia se demonstrauit infantem, et Dei Verbum sine uerbis uocem carnis emisit*. The wisdom of God has shown itself as an infant child, the Word of God has let itself be heard as a human voice. This confirms that God, who stands outside time, was born within time (*quando*) as man. The faithful will be able to detect a scriptural basis both for the element of divinity and for the element of humanity. *Dei sapientia* is a reference not only to I Cor. 1, 24b (*Christum Dei uirtutem et Dei sapientiam*), but also – as will become apparent in the first segment of the second part – to I Cor. 1, 30b (*qui factus est sapientia nobis a Deo*). *Dei Verbum* refers to Ioh. 1, 1a-c (a *in principio erat Verbum*, b *et Verbum erat apud Deum*, c *et Deus erat Verbum*). The infant child can be found in Luc. 2, 12b (*inuenietis infantem*) and/or 2, 16c (*et infantem*).

To ensure that Christ's imperceptible divinity is not overshadowed by his perceptible humanity, Augustine mentions it in two ways: by referring to the guiding star which the Magi saw (Matth. 2, 1-12) and by referring to the angel, later joined by a multitude of angels, who appeared to the shepherds (Luc. 2, 8-20).³³ He does this in the statement: *Illa tamen occulta diuinitas et magis caelo teste significata, et pastoribus angelica uoce nuntiata est*. These references to Matth. 2, 1-12 and Luc. 2, 8-20 give scriptural support to the first statement (*Natalis domini dicitur, quando (...), et (...)*). The particle *tamen* indicates that these actions were in fact unnecessary: they were, as it were, a special service to humankind. If humankind did not know already that God had been born as man, these events suffice to convey the message.³⁴

The expected conclusion, marked by the particle *igitur*, is, therefore, that the faithful celebrate this day as the day on which the prophecy was ful-

³³ Cf. s. 184,3: *Merito ergo prophetae nuntiauerunt nasciturum, caeli uero atque angeli natum*.

³⁴ For *tamen* see R. KÜHNER – C. STEGMANN, *Ausführliche Grammatik der Lateinischen Sprache, II. Satzlehre, II. Teil*, Hannover, 1914, pp. 98-99. P. 98: "Tamen zeigt an, dass der Gedanke des adversativen Satzes die gleiche Berechtigung hat, wie der, dem er gegenübergestellt wird. Es setzt deshalb immer einen konzessiven Gedanken voraus". Augustine admits that God has become man, and, as such, has become perceptible. Although this would have been sufficient in itself, God did even more to ensure that this momentous occasion would quickly become widely known among humankind: the explicit announcement to the Magi and the shepherds.

filled: *Hanc igitur anniuersaria sollemnitate celebramus diem, qua impleta est propheta dicens: "Veritas de terra orta est, et iustitia de caelo prospexit"*. Through this statement Augustine connects the day of Christ's birth with the day of today. The prophecy that is fulfilled today is a reference to Ps. 84 (85), 12a-b (*a ueritas de terra orta est, b et iustitia de caelo prospexit*). Augustine quotes this text in its entirety.

An Elaboration

Augustinus often uses the first part of Ps. 84 (85), 12 (*a ueritas de terra orta est*) in connection with the birth of God as man.³⁵ The passage appears here as well, as is clear from the following complex section, in which Augustine contrasts Christ's divinity with his humanity, or rather, connects the one with the other. He does this in four parallel sentences, each of them based on Ps. 84 (85), 12a. He uses the element *ueritas* each time to represent Christ's divinity, and illustrates it in each case by an adjectival clause based on scriptural data: 1.1 *quae est in sinu patris* (cf. Ioh. 1, 18b), 2.1 *qua mundus continetur* (cf. Sap. 1, 7a-b), 3.1 *qua beatitudo angelorum incorruptibiliter alitur* (cf. Sap. 16, 20a-b) and 4.1 *cui caelum non sufficit* (cf. II Par 6, 18b). Augustine uses the element *de terra orta* each time to represent Christ's humanity, in each case adding a final clause based on scriptural data: 1.2 *ut esset etiam in sinu matris* (cf. Luc. 11, 27c), 2.2 *ut femineis manibus portaretur* (cf. Luc. 2, 7), 3.2 *ut carnalibus uberibus lactaretur* (cf. Luc. 11, 27c) en 4.2 *ut in praesepio poneretur* (cf. Luc. 2, 7c.12b.16c).

See the following table for an overview of this complex section:

	An elaboration
	1.1 <i>Veritas, quae est in sinu patris, de terra orta est,</i> 1.2 <i>ut esset etiam in sinu matris.</i> 2.1 <i>Veritas, qua mundus continetur, de terra orta est,</i> 2.2 <i>ut femineis manibus portaretur</i> 3.1 <i>Veritas, qua beatitudo angelorum incorruptibiliter alitur, de terra orta est,</i> 3.2 <i>ut carnalibus uberibus lactaretur.</i> 4.1 <i>Veritas, cui caelum non sufficit, de terra orta est,</i> 4.2 <i>ut in praesepio poneretur.</i>

³⁵ Cf. for instance en.Ps. 84,13: *Veritas de terra orta est: Christus de femina natus est. Veritas de terra orta est: filius Dei de carne processit* and s. 192,1: *Hodie ueritas de terra orta est: Christus de carne natus est.*

A Second Segment

An explicit question follows, indicating that Augustine is turning to a new subject:³⁶ *Cuius bono in tanta humilitate uenit tanta sublimitas?*³⁷ *Tanta sublimitas* retrospectively interprets the element *ueritas*, which Augustine illustrated four times in the previous segment by an adjectival clause: it represents Christ's divinity. *Tanta humilitate* retrospectively interprets the element *de terra orta est*, to which Augustine four times added a final clause in the previous segment: it represents Christ's humanity. The sublime (God) has become humble (man). The question that remains is: on whose behalf did this happen?

Augustine answers his own question in the next statement: *Nulli utique suo, sed magno, si credimus, nostro*. The adverb *utique* is an indication of the great certainty that Augustine feels and emphasises using the evaluative particle *utique*: God has become man on our behalf. The conditional clause *si credimus* expresses the only thing that can impede or nullify the effect of this action: not believing. The clause must, therefore, be regarded as an implicit exhortation.

A Third Segment

The implicit exhortation contained in *si credimus* opens the way for the two explicit commands that follow. In these commands, Augustine individually addresses each member of his audience in the second person singular (he explicitly mentions the addressee in the first command): *Expergiscere, homo*, and: *Surge, qui dormis, et exsurge a mortuis, et illuminabit te Christus*, which he motivates thus: *pro te, inquam, Deus factus est homo*. The second command is an unmistakable reference to Eph. 5, 14b-d (b *surge, qui dormis*, c *et exsurge a mortuis*, d *et illuminabit tibi Christus*), while Augustine also incorporated 14d (*et illuminabit te Christus*), not simply to mention the reward, but also to draw attention to the notion of 'light' (*lumen*). This is the only place in this sermon where Augustine mentions the idea of light.

Both commands are motivated in a repeated statement, which is perhaps based on the creed: *pro te (, inquam,) Deus factus est homo*.

A poetical complex of *irreales* forms the conclusion of the first part. This complex describes the fatal condition that would have been humankind's if God had not become man. Augustine does this in six parallel sentences.

³⁶ An explicit question is a question that the author answers himself in his next utterance. See PANDER MAAT, 2002, p. 147.

³⁷ Cf. s. 184,1: *Quid enim nobis praestiterit tantae sublimitatis humilitas, (...)*.

Humankind is the subject of the main clause in each of these: 1.1 *In aeternum mortuus esses* (cf. Ioh. 11, 26a), 2.1 *Numquam librerareris a carne peccati* (cf. Rom. 8, 2b), 3.1 *Perpetua te possideret miseria*, 4.1 *Non reuixisses* (cf. Rom. 14, 9a (?)), 5.1 *Defecisses* and 6.1 *Perisses* (cf. Matth. 18, 11). In each case, the incarnate God is the subject of the subordinate clause (*nisi*): 1.2 *nisi in tempore natus esset* (cf. Matth. 2, 1a), 2.2 *nisi suscepisset similitudinem carnis peccati* (cf. Rom. 8, 3b), 3.2 *nisi fieret haec misericordia* (cf. Rom. 7, 25a (?)), 4.2 *nisi tuae morti conuenisset* (cf. Phil. 2, 8a), 5.2 *nisi subuenisset* and 6.2 *nisi uenisset* (cf. Matth. 18, 11). In the six principal clauses Augustine describes the condition that would have been humankind's if Christ had not done what he did. In the six matching subordinate clauses, he describes what Christ did to prevent humankind from ending up in the condition which has been detailed in the principal clauses.

The First Part of s. 185: a Coherent Whole

The first part is, therefore, a coherent whole, in which Augustine does three things. First, he indicates that God was born as man. Second, he links Christ's divinity to sublimity (*sublimitas*) and his humanity to humility (*humilitas*). It can be deduced from the implicit exhortation to believe (*si credimus*) that Augustine does not think human beings are already in possession of the humility that is a prerequisite for belief. The implicit exhortation to believe is, therefore, simultaneously an implicit exhortation to abandon pride (which is not mentioned explicitly) and to accept humility. Third, on these grounds he commands human beings to rouse themselves from sleep and arise.

Schematically, the first part looks like this:

	S. 185, part 1
1	Statements
1	<i>Natalis domini dicitur, quando Dei sapientia se demonstrauit infantem, et Dei Verbum sine uerbis uocem carnis emisit.</i>
2	<i>Illa tamen occulta diuinitas, et magis caelo teste significata, et pastoribus angelica uoce nuntiata est.</i>

3	<i>Hanc igitur anniuersaria sollemnitate celebramus diem, qua impleta est prophetia: "Veritas de terra orta est, et iustitia de caelo prospexit".</i>
	An illustrative elaboration (see the table above)
	<i>Veritas, (...).</i>
2	Explicit question
<i>Cuius bono in tanta humilitate uenit tanta sublimitas? Nulli utique suo, sed magno, si credimus, nostro.</i>	
3	Commands
1	1 <i>Expergiscere, homo!</i> 2 <i>Surge, qui dormis, et exsurge a mortuis, et illuminabit te Christus!</i>
2	1 <i>Pro te Deus factus est homo.</i> 2 <i>Pro te, inquam, Deus factus est homo.</i>
3	1.1 <i>In aeternum mortuus esses,</i> 1.2 <i>nisi in tempore natus esset.</i> 2.1 <i>Numquam liberareris a carne peccati,</i> 2.2 <i>nisi suscepisset similitudinem carnis peccati.</i> 3.1 <i>Perpetua te possideret miseria,</i> 3.2 <i>nisi fieret haec misericordia.</i> 4.1 <i>Non reuixisses,</i> 4.2 <i>nisi tuae morti conuenisset.</i> 5.1 <i>Defecisses,</i> 5.2 <i>nisi subuenisset.</i> 6.1 <i>Perisses,</i> 6.2 <i>nisi uenisset.</i>

A Second Part

A First Segment

Having made his listeners aware of what they have to do to benefit from the birth of God as man, Augustine now goes one step further, introdu-

cing a heavy marker. Augustine starts with two exhortations. After he has concluded the first part with a symmetrically structured complex of unreal situations, these exhortations give the impression that he is beginning the sermon afresh: 1 *Celebremus laeti nostrae salutis et redemptionis aduentum*, and: 2 *Celebremus festum diem, quo magnus et aeternus dies ex magno et aeterno die uenit in hunc nostrum tam breuem temporalem diem*. The first exhortation contains a reference to I Cor. 1, 30c (*et iustitia et sanctificatio et redemptio*), which is part of a larger whole that will be quoted in the second segment. The second exhortation is based on a complex of texts, including a combination of Ps. 117 (118), 24a (*haec est dies, quam fecit dominus*) and Ps. 95 (96), 2b (LXX) (*adnuntiate diem de die salutare eius*). The adverbial phrase *diem ex die* (from day to day) has been transformed into a direct object (day coming forth from day), thus resembling more closely a passage from the Creed (*Deum de Deo*).³⁸

A Second Segment

Augustine then offers corroboration for both exhortations. He does this in the following statement: *Hic est nobis factus iustitia et sanctificatio et redemptio, ut, quemadmodum scriptum est, qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*, which derives from I Cor. 1, 30b-31a-b (30b *qui factus est*, c *et iustitia et sanctificatio et redemptio*, 31a *ut, quemadmodum scriptum est*, b *qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*).³⁹ His listeners know why they must celebrate: because Christ has become for them justice, sanctification and salvation, in order that they may be humble and know their place. This last aspect is apparent from the words *qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*, which ultimately derive from Ier. 9, 24a-b (*a sed in hoc gloriatur, qui gloriatur, b scire et nosse me, quia ego sum dominus*), where the prophet dissuades people to take pride in their human qualities, advising them rather to take pride in their knowledge of God. Augustine gives a corroboration of its own for the thought that human beings should be humble and know their place. In this motivation he compares the Christians with the Jews. The Christians are designated as *nos*. Unlike the Jews they are not mentioned explicitly. Augus-

³⁸ See above. Augustine carries out this transformation in several sermons, including in the first segment of the first part of s. 184.

³⁹ For a modern interpretation of I Cor. 1, 30b-31a-b see W. SCHRAGE, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1,1-6,11)*, Zürich, 1991 (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, VII/1), p. 217: "(...), dass es dann, wenn Gott in dieser überschwenglichen Weise für das Heil gesorgt hat und alles seine Tat und Gabe ist, nur noch das Rühmen des Kyrios geben kann. (...). Wer sich rühmt, der rühme sich des Herrn, der in Exklusivität und Suffizienz im Kreuz Jesu alles gewährt, was zum Heil der Menschen nötig ist".

tine refers to Rom. 10, 3a-b (*a ignorantes enim Dei iustitiam, b et suam quaerentes statuere, c iustitiae Dei non sunt subiecti*) concerning the Jews.⁴⁰ This leads him to the conclusion that the Jews are not humble and do not know their place. It is within this framework that the second part of Ps. 84 (85) – mentioned but not discussed in the first part – is reintroduced, i.e. 12b (*et iustitia de caelo prospexit*). Augustine announces: *Ut enim superbiae Iudaeorum similes non essemus, qui ignorantes Dei iustitiam, et suam uolentes constituere, iustitiae Dei non sunt subiecti, propterea, cum dixisset: "Veritas de terra orta est", mox addidit: "et iustitia de caelo prospexit", ne sibi eam mortalis infirmitas arrogaret, ne ista sua diceret, et se homo a se ipso iustificari, hoc est: a se iustum fieri credens, Dei iustitiam recusaret.*

A Third Segment

Finally, Augustine concludes with a complex section, in which he repeats Ps. 84 (85), 12a-b (both parts) three times. The presence of the particle *ergo* indicates that he assumes that his audience not only follows his line of reasoning, but also agrees with it. Each time, he explains the first part (*a ueritas de terra orta est*) as referring to the incarnation:⁴¹ 1.1 *Christus, qui dixit: 'Ego sum ueritas'* (cf. Ioh. 14, 6b), *de uirgine natus est* (cf. Luc. 2, 1-7), 2.1 *quia Verbum caro factum est* (cf. Ioh. 1, 14a) and 3.1 *caro de Maria* (cf. Luc. 2, 1-7). Each time, he explains the second part (*b et iustitia de caelo prospexit*) as referring to grace:⁴² 1.2 *quoniam credens in eum, qui natus est, non homo a se ipso, sed a Deo iustificatus est* (cf. Rom. 5, 1), 2.2 *quia omne datum optimum et omne datum perfectum seorsum est* (cf. Iac. 1, 17a) and 3.2 *quia non potest homo accipere quidquam, nisi fuerit illi datum de caelo* (cf. Ioh. 3, 27b). Through his humanity, which, according to the first part, represents his humility, Christ sets the example of humility to which human beings should become open. Through his divinity, which, according to the first part, represents the sublime, he embodies the justice

⁴⁰ For a modern interpretation of Rom. 10, 3 see U. WILCKENS, *Der Brief an die Römer (Röm 6-11)*, Zürich, (1980) 1993 (Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, VI/2), p. 220: "Für das Verständnis dessen, was mit der 'eigenen' Gerechtigkeit gemeint ist, ist es sehr wichtig zu sehen, dass es sich um ein Verhalten gegenüber und entgegen der in Sühnetod Christi offenbar gewordenen Gottesgerechtigkeit handelt. Die Juden lehnen es ab, sich ihr zu unterwerfen, und streben stattdessen danach, das, was nur die Gottesgerechtigkeit kann und tut, nämlich den Sünder gerecht zu machen, selbst zu tun, nämlich in den Werken des Gesetzes".

⁴¹ Cf. s. 189,2: *Ergo quia ueritas de terra orta est, dominus noster Iesus Christus de uirgine natus est, (...).*

⁴² Cf. s. 189,2: (...), *iustitia de caelo prospexit, ut haberent homines iustitiam non suam, sed Dei.*

that descends upon human beings once they have, by believing in him (*credens in eum*, a reference to *si credimus* in the first part), accepted his humility. Only then will they be open to grace. In this way Augustine represents faith not as something which human beings can achieve by themselves, but as a first manifestation of the operation of grace.

The Second Part of s. 185: a Coherent Whole

Like the first part, the second part is, therefore, a coherent whole, in which Augustine does three things. First, he indicates that God has become man in order to bring salvation and redemption. Second, he points out that not everybody is willing to acknowledge God's justice. He uses the Jews as an example. Third, he concludes that Christ has become man, while remaining God. As man he is perceptible. Whoever humbly believes in him will experience Christ's divinity in the sense that the grace God gives will be fulfilled.

Schematically, the second part looks like this:

	S. 185, part 2
1	Exhortations
	<p>1 <i>Celebremus laeti nostrae salutis et redemptionis aduentum.</i> 2 <i>Celebremus festum diem,</i> <i>quo magnus et aeternus dies ex magno et aeterno die uenit in hunc nostrum tam breuem</i> <i>temporalem diem.</i></p>
2	Corroboration of the exhortations
	<p><i>Hic est nobis factus iustitia, et sanctificatio, et redemptio,</i> <i>ut, quemadmodum scriptum est, qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur.</i></p> <div> <p><i>Ut (...),</i> <i>propterea, cum dixisset: "Veritas de terra orta est",</i> <i>mox addidit: "et iustitia de caelo prospexit",</i> <i>ne (...).</i></p> </div>
3	Conclusion
	<p>1.1 <i>Veritas ergo de terra orta est,</i> <i>Christus, qui dixit: "Ego sum ueritas," de uirgine natus est.</i></p>

1.2	<i>Et iustitia de caelo prospexit, quoniam credens in eum, qui natus est, non homo a se ipso, sed a Deo iustificatus est.</i>
2.1	<i>Veritas de terra orta est, qui Verbum caro factum est.</i>
2.2	<i>Et iustitia de caelo prospexit, quia omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est.</i>
3.1	<i>Veritas de terra orta est, caro de Maria.</i>
3.2	<i>Et iustitia de caelo prospexit, quia non potest homo accipere quicquam, nisi fuerit ei datum de caelo.</i>

A Third Part

A First Segment

Now that it has become clear that human beings can, through the man whom Christ has become, reach the God whom Christ will always remain – provided they believe in humility and thus become susceptible to his grace –, Augustine concludes the sermon. He begins with a scriptural exhortation in the form of Rom. 5, 1-2, which he quotes in its entirety (1a *iustificati igitur ex fide*, b *pacem habeamus ad Deum*, c *per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum*, 2a *per quem et accessum habemus fide in gratiam istam*, b *in qua stamus, et gloriamur in spe gloriae filiorum Dei*): *Iustificati igitur ex fide, pacem habeamus ad Deum, per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, per quem et accessum habemus in gratiam istam, in qua stamus, et gloriamur in spe gloriae Dei*. This long quotation marks the transition from the symmetrically structured complex section which concluded the second part to the beginning of the third part, resulting in a heavy marker. Augustine adopts the particle *igitur* together with the rest of the quotation.

Subsequently, Augustine announces that he will place this authoritative text (*[apostolica uerba]*, *quae mecum recognoscitis*) beside the text of Ps. 84 (85) (*psalmi huius*),⁴³ to which he referred several times before, and which is, of course, an authoritative text in its own right. He wants to ascertain that both texts represent the same message: *His, fratres, quae mecum recognoscitis, paucis apostolicis uerbis, pauca uerba psalmi huius admiscere delectat, et consonantiam reperire*. He points out the harmony that exists between the Psalm and the apostle with the word *consonantia*, inferring that both consequently represent the same message.⁴⁴ His choice of the compound

⁴³ The verb used is *admiscere*, literally ‘to mix into’, thereby producing a whole.

⁴⁴ *Consonantia* (a ‘sounding together’) is originally a musical term. According to Augustine *consonantia* is the equivalent of *symphonia*. In en.Ps. 49,4 Augustine ascertains the existence of a *consonantia* between the two Testaments: *Et consonant duo testamenta, et unam*

verb *reperire* (to find (back)), deriving from the simplex verb *parere* (to bear/give birth),⁴⁵ can hardly be coincidental, although it remains the question whether his audience would have noticed the connection.

Augustine then offers a comparison of both passages by juxtaposing the text of Rom. 5, 1a-b and the text of Ps. 84 (85), 11b (*iustitia et pax osculae sunt*), a passage that has not been mentioned before but that is important for the rest of the sermon because it contains the words *iustitia* and *pax*. Subsequently, Augustine juxtaposes the text of Rom. 5, 1c and that of Ps. 84 (85), 12a, and, finally, the text of Rom. 5, 2 and that of Ps. 84 (85), 12b. In the case of the last juxtaposition, that of Rom. 5, 2 and Ps. 84 (85), 12b, Augustine makes an observation on the sentence constituent *gloriae Dei*, with the express aim of enabling a connection between both texts. In doing so, he also refers to I Cor. 1, 31b (*qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*), a passage which he used before, and which here receives additional corroboration.

A Second Segment

The word *gloria* plays an important role in the corroboration which Augustine provides following his comparative enquiry of biblical texts. There are two corroborative arguments, followed by a similar number of conclusions. The opening sections of both corroborative arguments are parallelistic: *Hinc enim (...) (praeconium uocis angelicae) factum est*, and: *Hinc enim dictum est*. They both follow a reference to I Cor. 1, 31b (*qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*), and both precede a scriptural quotation. Both corroborative arguments thus start with the adverb *hinc*, which Augustine uses to refer back to the comparison between Rom. 5, 1-2 and Ps. 84 (85), 11b-12 he made in the first segment. By using the consensus particle *enim* he expressly indicates that he wants to involve his audience in the argument – and expects it to comply with his wish. Lastly, both sections conclude with a predicate in the third person singular perfect passive: (...) *factum est*, and *dictum est*.

The first corroborative argument following on the comparative enquiry of the first segment is based on Luc. 2, 14a-b (a *gloria in excelsis Deo*, b

uocem habent duo testamenta. Audiatur uox concinentium testamentorum, non calumniantium exheredatorum. In s. 165,1 he uses the principle of *consonantia* in order to explain why we must not put our hope in ourselves, but in the Lord: *Apostolum audiuius, psalmum audiuius, euangelium audiuius, consonant omnes diuinae lectiones, ut spem non in nobis, sed in domino collocemus*. Augustine thus presupposes the existence of harmony between the apostle, the Psalm, and the gospel.

⁴⁵ See ERNOUT – MEILLET, 1951, p. 856.

et in terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis), and concerns Christ, who, through his humanity, brings about the humility of faith. Augustine begins the first corroborative argument with: *Hinc enim et nato ex uirgine domino, cuius diem natalem hodie celebramus, praeconium uocis angelicae factum est: 'Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus'*. After this, he motivates the corroborative argument itself (*enim*) in a rhetorical question and a statement (*et*). The rhetorical question is *In terra enim pax unde, nisi quia ueritas de terra orta est, id est: Christus de carne natus est?* It incorporates Ps. 84 (85), 12a. The statement is *Et ipse est pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum, ut essemus homines bonae uoluntatis, suauiter connexi uinculis unitatis*. It incorporates Eph. 2, 14a (*ipse est enim pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum*). Thus the peace (*pax*) of Luc. 2, 14 is seen to consist of the fact that the God who, according to Ps. 84 (85), 12a, was born as man, is himself peace according to Eph. 2, 14a. Finally, Augustine concludes the corroborative argument (*igitur*) with the following exhortation: *In hac igitur gratia gaudeamus, ut sit gloria nostra testimonium conscientiae nostrae, ubi non in nobis, sed in domino gloriemur*. This is based on II Cor. 1, 12a (*nam gloria nostra haec est testimonium conscientiae nostrae*), together with I Cor. 1, 31b (*qui gloriatur, in domino gloriatur*).

The second corroborative argument, which follows the comparative enquiry of the first segment, but simultaneously supports the previous corroborative argument, is based on Ps. 3, 4 (*gloria mea, exaltans caput meum*), and concerns Christ, who, through his divinity, brings about grace. Augustine begins the second corroborative argument with *Hinc enim dictum est: 'Gloria mea, et exaltans caput meum'*. He subsequently explains the corroborative argument (*nam*) with a rhetorical question: *Nam quae maior gratia Dei nobis potuit illucescere* (cf. Ps. 117 (118), 27a), *quam ut habens unigenitum filium, faceret eum hominis filium, atque ita uicissim hominis filium, faceret Dei filium?* According to Augustine, the exaltation (*exaltare*) mentioned in Psalm 3, 4 consists of the fact that God, by becoming man, wants to turn men into God. The conclusion (not marked by a particle) consists of the following commands: *Quaere meritum, quaere causam, quaere iustitiam, et uide utrum inuenias nisi gratiam*.

[A Third Segment]

The conclusions of the corroborative arguments: *In hac igitur gratia gaudeamus, ut sit gloria nostra testimonium conscientiae nostrae, ubi non in nobis, sed in domino gloriemur*, and: *Quaere meritum, quaere causam, quaere iustitiam, et uide utrum inuenias nisi gratiam*, also constitute the conclusion of the third part as a whole.

The Third Part of s. 185: a Coherent Whole

The third part, too, is therefore a coherent whole. Augustine begins by juxtaposing Rom. 5, 1-2 and Ps. 84 (85), 11b-12. His aim in doing so is to outline the concept of grace as described by Paul, which fits seamlessly with the text of the Psalm, which gains in value through this. Second, he shows the operation and effects of grace. Third, he exhorts his listeners to rejoice in grace, or commands them to regard all things as grace. The comparison of Rom. 5, 1-2 with Ps. 84 (85), 11b-12 on the one hand, and the exhortation/command to rejoice in grace on the other, enclose two corroborative arguments based on Scripture, in which Luc. 2, 14a-b and Ps. 3, 4 are placed side by side.

Schematically, the third part looks like this:

	S. 185, part 3	
1	Comparison of biblical texts	
	1	Quotation of Rom. 5, 1-2
	2	<i>His, fratres, (...), paucis apostolicis uerbis, pauca uerba psalmi huius admiscere delectat, et consonantiam reperire.</i>
	3	Comparison of Rom. 5, 1-2 with Ps. 84 (85), 11b-12.
2	Corroboration	
	1	Corroborative argument 1
	1	<i>Hinc enim et nato ex uirgine domino, (...), praeconium uocis angelicae factum est: "Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonae uoluntatis".</i>
		Corroboration of corroborative argument 1
	2	<i>In terra enim pax unde, nisi quia ueritas de terra orta est, id est: Christus de carne natus est? Et ipse es pax nostra, qui fecit utraque unum, ut essemus homines bonae uoluntatis, suauiter connexi uinculis unitatis.</i>

			Conclusion of corroborative argument 1
		3	<i>In hac igitur gratia gaudeamus, ut sit gloria nostra testimonium conscientiae nostrae, ubi non in nobis, sed in domino gloriemur.</i>
	2		Corroborative argument 2
		1	<i>Hinc enim dictum est: “Gloria mea, et exaltans caput meum”.</i>
			Corroboration of corroborative argument 2
		2	<i>Nam quae maior gratia Dei nobis potuit illucescere, quam ut habent unigenitum filium, faceret eum hominis filium, atque ita uicissim hominis filium, faceret Dei filium?</i>
			Conclusion of corroborative argument 2
		3	<i>Quaere meritum, quaere causam, quaere iustitiam, et uide utrum inuenias nisi gratiam.</i>
[3]	[Conclusion]		
			[Conclusion of the sermon 1]
		1	<i>[In hac igitur gratia gaudeamus, ut sit gloria nostra testimonium conscientiae nostrae, ubi non in nobis, sed in domino gloriemur.]</i>
			[Conclusion of the sermon 2]
		2	<i>[Quaere meritum, quaere causam, quaere iustitiam, et uide utrum inuenias nisi gratiam.]</i>

4. Sermones 184 and 185: *Well-Considered and Well-Structured Sermons in Three Parts*

It has become clear from this analysis that, however much they may differ from one another in other respects, *sermones* 184 and 185 are both composed of three well-rounded, internally coherent parts. Transitions indicated by light markers can be identified within these parts, transitions indicated by heavy markers appear between them.

Both sermons have a first part that begins with a reference to the day of God's birth as man, a day which is deserving of celebration (*celebrare*). In

s. 184, 1 it is *Natalis Domini et saluatoris nostri Iesu Christi, (...), anniuersario reditu nobis hodie celebrandus illuxit*; in s. 185,1 (following some information about this day): *Hanc (...) anniuersaria sollemnitate celebramus diem, (...)*. In their second part, both sermons exhort to the celebration of this day of birth. Thus s. 184,2 has *Proinde natalem Domini (...) celebremus*; and s. 185,2: 1 *Celebremus laeti nostrae salutis et redemptionis aduentum* and 2 *Celebremus festum diem, (...)*. The third part in both sermons contains a conclusion (this is evident from the particle *ergo*, which assumes the existence of consensus, and the particle *igitur*, which assumes self-evidence). In s. 184,3 it begins with *Merito ergo prophetae nuntiauerunt nasciturum, caeli uero atque angeli natum*, in s. 185,3 with *Iustificati igitur ex fide, pacem habeamus ad Deum per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, (...)*.

All parts contain a main theme, based, in so far as possible, upon one or more scriptural quotes or references that do not appear in the other parts. Although we have seen that Augustine uses the same structural principle in both sermons, they nonetheless differ to the extent that they contain two different ways of arriving at the third part, the central theme of which is the obtaining of grace. Thus s. 184 begins with a didactic moment, which is subsequently confirmed, while s. 185 begins with a preparation for this didactic moment, which is followed by the didactic moment itself. This requires some further explanation.

a. *The First Part*

Sermo 184,1: Didactic Moment: Christians Compared to the Unbelievers (Matth. 11, 25c-d)

In the first part of s. 184, Augustine starts from the thought that, while Christians are able to perceive the significance of God's birth as man, the unbelievers are not. He bases this notion on Matth. 11, 25c (for the unbelievers), and Matth. 11, 25d (for the Christians), both of which texts he also uses elsewhere.⁴⁶ According to Augustine, the Christians owe their advantageous position to their humility based on faith. This is why he explicitly calls them *humiles* (the humble). The unbelievers have their pride – based on lack of faith – to blame for their unfavourable position. In other words: Augustine stresses the Christians' humility based on faith by contrasting it with the unbelievers' pride based on their lack of faith. Having thus stressed the Christians' humility, Augustine connects it with their susceptibility to grace.

⁴⁶ For other instances where Augustine interprets Matth. 11, 25c-d in a similar, but more elaborate way see s. 67,8 and s. 68,3. Here, too, he emphasises the contrast between Christians and pagans.

God refuses the gift of grace to the unbelievers, but it is open to the Christians, who are faithful. The latter do not engage in empirical enquiry, which leads to nothing and would only hold them back from success. The didactic moment lies in realising that Christians must not live like the unbelievers.

Sermo 185,1: Preparation for the Didactic Moment: the Beneficiary

In the first part of s. 185, Augustine urges the Christians to recognise the significance of God's birth as man, which means that God's exaltedness (Augustine uses the term *sublimitas*) has humbled itself (*humilitas*). Augustine shows for whom and why this happened. The beneficiary is man (*Cuius bono? Nulli utique suo, sed magno nostro*), that is to say: the group designated as *nos*. Why it happened is clear from the manner in which God comes to humankind's aid: as a human being himself.

b. *The Second Part*

Sermo 184,2: Confirmation of the Didactic Moment: the Beneficiary

In the second part of s. 184, Augustine urges the Christians to recognise the significance of God's birth as man, which means that God's exaltedness has humbled itself by remaining God, while becoming man. Augustine shows for whom and why this happened. The beneficiary is man, represented here in the form of nine subgroups (*uiri et feminae, pueri sancti, uirgines sanctae, iusti, debiles et aegroti, captiui, serui, liberi* and *omnes christiani*), that is to say: the group designated as *nos*. Why it happened is clear from the nine ways in which Christ manifests himself for the benefit of these nine subgroups, and in which he comes to their aid: as a human being himself.

Sermo 185, 2: Didactic Moment: the Christians Compared to the Jews (I Cor. 1, 30b-31 and Rom. 10, 3)

In the second part of s. 185, Augustine starts from the thought that, while Christians are able to perceive the significance of God's birth as man, the Jews are not. He bases this notion on I Cor. 1, 30b-31 (for the Christians), and Rom. 10, 3 (for the Jews), both of which texts he also uses elsewhere.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ For another instance where Augustine interprets I Cor. 1, (30b)-31 and Rom. 10, 3 in a similar, but more elaborate way see s. 160,1. Here, too, Augustine emphasises the contrast between Christians and Jews.

According to Augustine, the Christians owe their advantageous position to their humility. The Jews have their pride to blame for their unfavourable position. This is why Augustine explicitly speaks of the *superbia Iudaeorum* (the pride of the Jews). In other words: Augustine stresses the Christians' humility by contrasting it with the Jews' pride. Having thus stressed the Christians' humility, he connects it with their susceptibility to grace. The Jews reject grace, but it is attainable for the Christians. The latter allow themselves to be roused from sleep and to be set in motion. The didactic moment lies in realising that Christians must not live like the Jews.

c. *The Third Part*

Sermo 184,3: *Grace*

In the third part of s. 184, Augustine connects the thought of Christ's divine exaltedness and his human humility, which has now become perceptible, with the thought of the grace (described as *sua munera*) which is thus given to humankind. In other words: he presents the birth of God as man as – at least a beginning of – the gift of grace that had been foretold, that has come, and that will be completed in the future when humans become Sons of God (*Dei filii*).

Sermo 185,3: *Grace*

In the third part of s. 185, Augustine connects the thought of Christ's divine exaltedness and his human humility, which has now become perceptible, with the thought of the grace (*gratia*) which is thus given to humankind. In other words: he presents the birth of God as man as the gift of grace that had been foretold, and that has now come.

5. *A Flexible Structure*

As far as structure is concerned, the two sermons are based on the same concepts. However, the fact that the part containing the didactic moment is the first in s. 184, but the second in s. 185, suggests that the arrangement of the first two parts of the sermons is not fixed. Further research of other three-part sermons may shed light on this particular question.

The sermons include a part that contains their didactic moment (s 184,1 and s. 185,2). This is the moment that the listener is compelled to change his internal attitude, or is confirmed in this change, i.e. the moment that he is required to make the transition from pride to humility, in the same way that Christ made the transition from his exalted state to humility.

The example which Christ thus set must be followed. Christians in fact do this, unlike the pagans, who are unable (s. 184), and the Jews, who are unwilling to do so (s. 185). The didactic moment, therefore, concerns a mental insight, which causes pride to yield to humility and thereby confers the willingness to believe.⁴⁸ Thus Augustine offers the listener who already believes a helping hand, while providing a hopeful perspective to those believers who are not quite convinced yet. This is an important aspect of Augustine's preaching, his ability to 'demonstrate the possibility of persuasion and conversion'.⁴⁹

The sermons moreover include a part in which Augustine discusses the didactic moment, either preparing for it or looking back to it. In this part he discusses the necessity (s. 185,1) and consequences (s. 184,2) respectively, of the required internal change. His listeners must stop searching for rational explanations. In both cases Augustine offers a helping hand in taking the first step in the process of awakening, which is necessary in order to prepare for the didactic moment (s. 185: awakening from sleep), or to confirm it (s. 184: a well-attended, festive celebration).

Finally the sermons end with a concluding part (s. 184,3 and s. 185,3). In this part Augustine stresses the importance of grace, which flows forth from Christ's action, and which is given neither to the pagans nor to the Jews, but only to Christians. They are the people who not only witnessed Christ's action, but also acted upon it.

6. Conclusion

Sermones 184 and 185 do not comply with the standard sermon structure which Augustine himself proffers in *doctr.chr.* 4,2,3 and 4,4,6. They

⁴⁸ For the phenomenon of *illuminatio* see R.H. NASH, "Illumination, Divine", in *Augustine through the Ages. An Encyclopedia* – ed. A.D. FITZGERALD, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1999, p. 438: "He also uses his doctrine of the divine light to make the point that no soul is self-sufficient; no soul can be a light unto itself. Instead our minds must be illuminated by participation in God's light. Whatever we do – thinking, speaking or acting – we need the help of God". See also L. SCHUMACHER, *Divine illumination, The history and future of Augustine's theory of knowledge*, Chichester, 2011, p. 65: "On Augustine's account, all that comes to the intellect from the outside is the power to be renewed on the inside; this is the power to illumine the divine being that is received through divine illumination – the power to know like God and thus know God. Here at last the logic of Augustine's claim that divine illumination is the condition of the possibility of all human knowledge comes into relief – for unless God gives the capacity to know Him and it is used to the end of knowing Him, there is no such thing as knowing of knowledge at all".

⁴⁹ See J.J. O'DONNELL, *Augustine, A new biography*, New York, 2005, p. 31: "The performer's achievement is to embody the opinions of some, flout the opinions of others, and demonstrate the possibility of persuasion and conversion".

nonetheless have a clear three-part structure. Unlike in *sermones* 186 and 187, which contain a two-part instruction in parts two and three, with part two leading up to part three, Augustine does not aim for a 'linear' structure in *sermones* 184 and 185. Exhortation and instruction are spread over the entire sermon. There are no parts that correspond/contrast with one another. They lack a separate introductory part (an *exordium*) with a corresponding concluding part (a *peroratio*) such as can be found in *sermones* 186 and 187. In *sermones* 184 and 185, the elements that could be considered to be the introduction and the conclusion (and that were perhaps intended as such) are part of the internally coherent parts one and three. They are, in fact, segments of parts and not parts in themselves. Because of the interchangeability of parts one and two that has become apparent from the comparison of the two sermons, parts one and two are not designed as such to correspond/contrast with part three.

We may conclude that *sermones* 184 and 185 are not only stylistically beautiful,⁵⁰ but also carefully structured texts with a characteristic arrangement which is easily justifiable, and which clearly shows Augustine's flexibility. The three-part structure presented above is far from erratic.⁵¹ Reading these sermons in accordance with this structure brings us a step closer towards unlocking their meaning, and helps us to gain a better insight into their "hidden' psychagogic form".⁵²

Summary

A previous article has demonstrated on the basis of a twofold analysis – of the use of language and of Scripture – that *sermones* 186 and 187 each consist of four parts. The current article shows on the basis of a similar investigation that *sermones* 184 and 185 must be divided into three parts. The article's study of the use of language focuses on such aspects as change of sentence type, use of particles and unusual constituent order, while its exploration of the use of Scripture looks at the occurrence of biblical passages or clusters of biblical passages. Both the use of language and the use of Scripture demonstrate the existence of tran-

⁵⁰ Drobner quite rightly emphasizes the elaborate style of ss. 184 and 185. See DROBNER, 2003, p. 90: "(...) eine ganz ausserordentlich hochrhetorische Predigt" (on s. 184), and p. 108: "Der für Augustins Weihnachtspredigten so typische hymnische Stil, der ca. ein Drittel des sermo prägt" (on s. 185). See also E. HILL, *Sermons III/6 (184-229Z) on the Liturgical Seasons*, New York, 1993 (The Works of Saint Augustine, A Translation for the 21st Century), p. 19, n. 1 (on s. 184): "The style of this sermon is so unusually elaborate, the work of a man pulling out all the rhetorical stops of the professional orator".

⁵¹ See n. 8 above.

⁵² See KOLBET 2010, p. 208, quoted n. 9 above.

sitions, highlighted by markers. It appears that, beside a division into four parts (introduction, preparation for the didactic moment, the didactic moment itself and conclusion), Augustine sometimes used a threefold structure for his sermons. The introduction and conclusion receive less emphasis in these sermons (they are limited to a few references integrated into the first and the third parts), and Augustine either immediately begins with the didactic moment, subsequently confirming it (s. 184), or begins with a preparation for the didactic moment, followed by the didactic moment itself (s. 185). Both sermons conclude with a reflection in the third part. Thus Augustine is flexible regarding the first two parts (either of which can contain the didactic moment), and he uses different scriptural references. Nonetheless the format of the two sermons is identical, just as the format of *sermones* 186 and 187 was identical (a division into four parts). As he did in these latter four-part sermons, which each deal with a specific problem, Augustine has crafted his text very carefully in the *sermones* 184 and 185, which are festive and wide-ranging, and he has left nothing to chance. This article contributes to the debate on whether or not there is ordered structure and argument in Augustine's sermons, and on the manner in which Augustine guides his audience to greater insight.

Local and Overseas Saints and Religious Identity in Vandal Africa*

Robert WIŚNIEWSKI

(Warsaw)

Throughout the Middle Ages and the modern period, the cult of saints was both a connecting and divisive force. Cities, regions, nations, and religious denominations united around their patron saint whose cult at the same time helped them to differentiate themselves from outsiders. In Late Antiquity, when the very idea of the patron saint emerged for the first time, several medieval frontiers did not exist yet. Thus scholars dealing with this period quite rarely view the cult of saints as an important factor for creating an ethnic or political identity, though they recognise that it could be used as a distinctive mark by competing religious communities or their leaders, like Damasus in Rome or Ambrose in Milan.¹ From this point of view, a special case was the Latin-speaking provinces of Roman Africa, which in Late Antiquity witnessed a sequence of fierce struggles between several religious (and also partly ethnic) groups which tried hard to mark their distinctiveness. In the fourth century, the conflict divided Donatists and ‘Catholics’.² Early in the fifth century, shortly after the latter

* An early version of this paper was presented at the conference “*Cuius patrocinio tota gaudet regio. Saints’ Cults and the Dynamics of Regional Cohesion*”, held in Dubrovnik in 2012, and I am grateful to its participants for their questions and remarks. My special thanks go to Stanisław Adamiak and Maya Maskarinec for their comments on successive versions of this article (and to Maya also for improving my English). The research was financed by a grant from the National Science Centre (UMO-2011/01/B/HS3/00736).

¹ Damasus, see: M. SAGHY, “Scinditur in partes populus: Pope Damasus and the Martyrs of Rome”, *Early Medieval Europe*, 9 (2000), pp. 273-287; Ambrose, see: N. McLYNN, *Ambrose of Milan: Church and Court in a Christian Capital*, Berkeley, 1994, esp. pp. 209-215; Asterius of Amasea, see: J. LEEMANS, “Christian Diversity in Amaseia: A Bishop’s View”, *Adamantius*, 13 (2007), pp. 247-257; Augustine, see: A. DUPONT, “Augustine’s Homiletic Definition of Martyrdom: The Centrality of the Martyr’s Grace in his Anti-Donatist and Anti-Pelagian Sermones ad Populum”, in *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity (300-450 AD)* – eds. P. GEMEINHARDT – J. LEEMANS, Berlin – Boston 2012, pp. 155-178.

² Throughout this article, I will use three terms which need some explanation. The adjective ‘Catholic’ will consequently denote the anti-Donatist, Nicene Church (in spite of the fact that it was not the only religious community in Africa, which claimed to be the true Catholic Church). The term ‘Arian’, which in our sources is a collective label for all

group, supported by the state, prevailed in the conflict, Africa was invaded by Arian Vandals who ruled until their kingdom fell in 534 and the Byzantine army restored Roman and Catholic order which lasted until the Arab conquest late in the seventh century. Each of these political turning points created a new religious situation in which different groups tried to mark a frontier between themselves – the true believers – and the others – traitors, schismatics, or heretics.

Scholarship has suggested that these divisions were also expressed in and exacerbated by the fact that competing churches worshipped different sets of saints, especially those from overseas. There has been no unanimity, however, as to who worshipped whom. In his early studies, W.H.C. Frend remarked that Peter and Paul were named most frequently in inscriptions from Numidia, and argued that cult of these martyrs had spread particularly among Donatists who were active in this region and whom he considered to be mostly a Numidian or Berber religious group. Since then, the ethnic identification of the Donatists has been abandoned, but the link between the cult of famous foreign saints and a specific religious faction has been retained. Later, Frend suggested that early in the fifth century the cult of overseas saints was promoted in Africa as a mark of communion with Rome and other parts of the Christian world and so advanced with the progressive 're-catholicization' of this region and the repression of Donatism.³ Frend's early thesis, about the popularity of the cult of Peter and Paul among Donatists, was also disputed by Dominique Raynal and Yvette Duval. They maintained that the inscriptions naming the Apostles should be dated instead to the Vandal period, when they were venerated to emphasize a Catholic or anti-Arian character of the 'Roman' Church in Africa.⁴

those who rejected the Nicene creed, here will refer to the partisans of the homoian doctrine. 'Ethnic' will be employed in reference to the fifth-century identity of Vandals (see J.H.W.G. LIEBESCHUETZ, "Gens into Regnum: The Vandals", in Regna and Gentes. *The Relationship between Late Antique and Early Medieval Peoples and Kingdoms in the Transformation of the Roman World* – ed. H.-W. GOETZ – J. JARNUT – W. POHL, Leiden–New York, 2002, pp. 55–83, esp. pp. 70–71). Its use does not indicate my sympathizing with the traditional vision of late antique migrations of fully formed nations, see W. POHL, "Rome and the Barbarians in the Fifth Century", *Antiquité Tardive*, 16 (2008), pp. 93–101, esp. 95–97.

³ W.H.C. FREND, "The Memoriae Apostolorum in Roman North Africa", *Journal of Roman Studies*, 30 (1940), pp. 32–49 (Donatism); id., *Donatist Church. Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa*, Oxford, 1952 (Donatists and Berbers); id. "From Donatist Opposition to Byzantine Loyalty. The Cult of Martyrs in North Africa 350–650", in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers. New Perspectives on Late Antique North Africa* – ed. A.H. MERRILLS, Aldershot, 2004, pp. 259–269, at p. 264 (Catholicism).

⁴ D. RAYNAL, "Culte des martyrs et propagande donatiste à Upenna", *Cahiers de Tunisie*, 21 (1973), pp. 33–72, at pp. 42–44 and id. *Archéologie et histoire de l'Église d'Afrique. Upenna II*, Toulouse, 2005, p. 773; Y. DUVAL, *Loca Sanctorum Africae*, Rome, 1982, vol. II,

In this article, my aim is to demonstrate that the evolution of the list of saints worshipped during the one hundred years of the Vandal reign was not heavily influenced by a rivalry of ethnic or religious groups trying to construct their identities and frontiers. For this purpose, I will study the entire accessible evidence which can be found in late antique literature, epigraphy, and calendars in order to trace the changes that occurred in the lists of saints in Africa from the fourth to the sixth century. I have no ambition of presenting any new sources unknown to the scholars mentioned above, but I will look at the sources they analysed a bit differently. Likewise, I will show what can be securely said about the saints worshiped by Catholics and Arians, explain what caused the evolution of the African sanctoral, and place these changes in a wider context of the spread of the cults of some successful saints in the Mediterranean from the fourth to the sixth century.

1. *Vandals and Romans and their Identities*

From the religious point of view, the kingdom which the Vandals created in Africa differed from other barbarian states in the West. The Vandals, just like the Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Burgundians, professed Arianism, but unlike them and very much in tune with Roman emperors, they considered the theological uniformity of the state very important.⁵ This induced them to persecute, or at least oppress, those whom they treated as heretics, namely the Nicenes and probably also the Donatists.⁶ The Vandals expelled, and sometimes killed clergymen, left episcopal sees vacant, seized several churches, and sometimes re-baptized Catholics. Certainly, the traditional image of the hardships of Vandal rule, created on the basis of Victor of Vita's *History of the Vandal Persecution*,⁷ our most important source

p. 634 (though Duval emphasizes that the spread of the cult of Peter and Paul is a wider phenomenon, not limited to Africa).

⁵ See Ch. COURTOIS, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, Paris–Algiers, 1955, p. 287; P. ARMORY, *People and Identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–544*, Cambridge, 1997, p. 308; Vandal kings' pursuit for religious unity: Y. MODÉLAN, "Une guerre de religion: les deux églises d'Afrique à l'époque vandale", *Antiquité Tardive*, 11 (2003), pp. 21–44; A. MERRILLS – R. MILES, *The Vandals*, Oxford, 2010, p. 71.

⁶ For Donatists under the Vandal rule see S. Adamiak, "Donatyści pod rządami Wandalów i Bizancjum", *U Schyłku Starożytności. Studia Źródłoznawcze* 8 (2009), pp. 13–31.

⁷ Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis Africanae provinciae* – ed. C. HALM, Berlin, 1879 (*MGH AA*, 3, 1), passim; see also *Vita Fulgentii* 3, 9, 6, 9, 13, 17; Gregory the Great, *Dialogi* III 32 – ed. A. DE VOGÜÉ, Paris, 1979 (*SC*, 260), pp. 390–392; Gregory of Tours, *Historia Francorum* II 2–3 – ed. B. KRUSCH, Hannover, 1937 (*MGH SRM*, 1,1), pp. 39–44; Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* IV 16 – ed. J. BIDEZ – L. PARMENTIER, London, 1898, p. 166.

for this period, is exaggerated. In recent decades, scholars have emphasized coexistence in Africa rather than violent conflict.⁸ Still, the conflict cannot be considered as just a product of Catholic propaganda.

In this context, it is important to ask whether the two groups accentuated their distinctiveness. Since for most Romans the temptation and possibility of making themselves similar to Germans was weaker than vice versa, this question mainly concerns the Vandals. The answer seems that they did. Although we know that Vandals spoke, and that some of them probably wrote, in Latin, they also used their own language. There is no doubt that they did it, perhaps ostentatiously, in a religious context: the worship in Arian churches in Africa was almost certainly celebrated in Vandalic and the Vandalic bishop Cyrila declined to discuss theological issues in Latin, pretending that he did not know this language.⁹ The only full, if short, sentence in Vandalic preserved in our evidence seems to be a liturgical formula. It runs: *froia arme*, or 'Lord, have mercy'.¹⁰ Similarly, Vandalic garments, at least those worn on official or religious occasions, probably differed from Roman dress.¹¹ It is difficult to say how strongly cultural differences were emphasized, but it seems that this occurred particularly in the religious sphere. That is why it is justifiable to ask whether the need of marking one's distinctiveness also appeared in the sphere of the cult of saints.

When answering this question we will face two problems. First, the distinction between the two groups is blurred by the fact that not all Vandals in Africa professed Arianism and not all Arians there were of Vandalic origin. Thus the ethnic and confessional frontiers do not overlap completely and, accordingly, assigning an exact denominational identification of people and sources on the basis of their language or names may be risky. Second, the evidence on the basis of which the cult of saints in Vandal Africa can be studied is quite scarce, especially for the Vandals and Arians. Very

⁸ See MERRILLS – MILES, *The Vandals, passim*, and the overview of recent studies in A.H. MERRILLS, "Vandals, Romans and Berbers. Understanding Late Antique North Africa", in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers*, pp. 3-28, at pp. 7-24.

⁹ This is implied by two passages in Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis* II 2, 4, p. 14 (Huneric demands emperor Zeno to allow the Arians in the East to worship in any language they want) and II 18, 55 (Cyrila pretends that he does not speak Latin), p. 25; see MERRILLS – MILES, *The Vandals*, pp. 94-95.

¹⁰ See N. FRANCOVICH ONESTI, "The Language and Names of the Vandals", in *Das Königreich der Vandalen: Erben des Imperiums in Nordafrika* – ed. C. HATTLER – S. HOXTER, M. BARTH, Karlsruhe, 2009, pp. 228-233; H. REICHERT, "Die Sprache der Vandalen in Afrika und 'Auch Römer dürfen *froia arme* für domine miserere sagen'", in *Collatio Augustini cum Pascentio* – ed. H.C. BRENNECKE – H. REICHERT – K. VÖSSING, Vienna, 2008, pp. 145-172.

¹¹ See Ph. VON RUMMEL, "*Habitus Vandalorum*. Zur Frage nach einer gruppen-spezifischen Kleidung der Vandalen in Nordafrika", *Antiquité Tardive*, 10 (2002), pp. 131-141.

little of Arian literature from Africa has survived and we have no Vandalic religious writings at all. Moreover, after the death of Augustine – who died in 430 in Hippo besieged by the Vandals – Catholic writings, too, are far fewer than they were in the previous period. There is, however, epigraphic evidence. Yvette Duval collected about 150 inscriptions from Africa naming saints worshiped in this region. About twenty-five of them can be possibly dated to the Vandal reign, against about forty which come from the pre-conquest times. Unfortunately, in most cases, their religious affinity is difficult to establish. Finally, a very valuable source is a Catholic calendar of Carthage, the present version of which dates to the early sixth century. Unfortunately, we do not have its Vandal equivalent.¹²

2. *Growing Popularity of Foreign Saints*

In trying to find out if the two groups differed with respect to the list of saints whom they worshipped, I will begin with the Catholics. As I said, we know more about them thanks to the available literary sources, calendar entries, and epigraphic material. As for the last group of evidence, however, one should be cautious; for if we do not find on an inscription a Germanic name, we usually interpret it as ordered by a Roman (and thus a Catholic) and this is not necessarily true, for three reasons. First, because Vandals sometimes had Latin names;¹³ second, because most inscriptions related to the cult of saints do not name their authors at all;¹⁴ and third, because a Roman could profess Arianism without declaring it in the inscription.

On the eve of the Vandal invasion, Africa was rich in saints. Given what we know about the density of ecclesiastical structures, the intensity of persecutions, and the number of their attested victims in diverse parts of the West, there is no doubt that Africa had far more local martyrs than any other region in this part of the world, with the exception of the city of Rome. Among them there were both major figures such as Cyprian or Perpetua, whose cults had already crossed the Mediterranean, and a crowd of very local saints often attested only by a single inscription. Most of them were probably venerated both by Catholics and Donatists, though the latter also had their own martyrs who were killed in persecutions or in simple

¹² *Acta Sanctorum Novembris* II 1 – ed. J.B. DE ROSSI – L. DUCHESNE, Brussels, 1894, pp. LXIX-LXXII.

¹³ See LIEBESCHUETZ, “*Gens into Regnum: The Vandals*”, p. 73; N. DUVAL, “Observations sur l’onomastique dans les inscriptions chrétiennes d’Afrique du Nord”, in *L’Onomastique latine. Paris, 13-15 Octobre, 1975*, Paris, 1977, pp. 447-456, at p. 452.

¹⁴ Only 51 out of 196 inscriptions in DUVAL’s *Loca Sanctorum Africae* have the dedicant’s name.

skirmishes with the former. All the saints who appear in the pre-conquest inscriptions in Africa, save Peter and Paul, are indigenous martyrs.¹⁵

In the following hundred years, however, the situation changed. In the inscriptions dating from the Vandal period we also find a few other overseas saints, namely two Roman martyrs, Lawrence and Hippolytus, Stephen the Protomartyr, Euphemia of Chalcedon, and possibly also Julian of Antioch and Vincent of Saragossa.¹⁶ The change is not dramatic, as most of these saints are named just once or twice, yet their presence seems to make a difference.

The adoption of the cult of overseas saints can be also seen in the early sixth century Calendar of Carthage which names, apart from about eighty African martyrs, a group of biblical saints (Three Youths, Maccabees, Luke, Andrew, Timothy, Stephen, James, John the Baptist, Peter, and Paul), seven Roman martyrs (Sixtus, Lawrence, Genesius, Clement, Chrysogonus, Sebastian, Agnes), three Italians (Sossius, Valentinus, Felix of Nola), and four martyrs from other regions: Agatha of Syracuse, Eulalia of Merida, Vincent of Saragossa, and Euphemia of Chalcedon.

One may add that some of these names are also attested in African onomastics, meaning that they were given to children. Iiro Kajanto, who collected African epigraphic evidence for people bearing saints' names, found four Laurentii, four Theclae, and ten Stephani named on inscriptions (compared to ten Perpetuae and twenty Cypriani).¹⁷ These numbers show that a few famous foreign saints managed to gain certain popularity in African onomastics, though, for our purpose, the usefulness of this evidence is quite limited since most of these inscriptions are very difficult to date precisely.

Yet the question is whether the growing interest of the African Church in the cult of saints venerated in other regions of the Christian world can be interpreted as a sign of religious resistance of Catholics against Vandal-Arians and their attachment to the Church being in communion with the bishop of Rome. I do not think so. Certainly, it is possible that in some specific situations the cult of a foreign saint could play such a role, but the evidence for this is feeble. Victor of Vita tells a story about a boy who resisted an attempt of Arian rebaptism, crying '*Christianus sum! Chris-*

¹⁵ These are the following inscriptions in DUVAL's *Loca Sanctorum Africae*: 27, 28, 29, 34, 56, 57, 63, 65, 67, 69, 70, 73, 74, 75, 76, 79, 80, 89, 97, 100, 101, 103, 117, 139, 140, 148, 156, 157, 169, 174, 181, 182, 183, 191, 195.

¹⁶ Lawrence (83, 128, 135, 141, 146), Hippolytus (141), Stephen (33, 147, 158), Euphemia (135), Julian (131, 132) and Vincent (64).

¹⁷ I. KAJANTO, *Onomastic Studies in the Early Christian Inscriptions from Rome and Africa*, Helsinki, 1963, pp. 97-100.

*tianus sum! Per sanctum Stephanum christianus sum!*¹⁸ The veracity of this episode cannot be proven, but one might suggest that at least Victor considered Stephen a proper saint to call upon when confronting Arians. Yet even this is far from being certain and it would be absurd to think that the cult of the great New Testament saint was rejected by the other side of the conflict. We know, for instance, that at the very end of the fifth century, the Latin African poet Dracontius, imprisoned by king Gunthamund for praising another ruler, acknowledged his guilt and begged for the king's mercy by quoting, among others, the example of Stephen who forgave his wrongdoers.¹⁹ The example would have been rather ill chosen if Vandals had been hostile or even indifferent to this saint. Still, there are also other reasons which warn us against considering that the cult of foreign saints in Africa spread in response to the Arian threat.

First of all, it should be noted that, although attested epigraphically only in the Vandal period, the cult of foreign saints actually arrived to Africa before the conquest. Peter, Paul, Stephen, Vincent, and Lawrence had their feasts in this region already at the beginning of the fifth century. Augustine preached at each of these feasts as well as at those of other overseas martyrs: Agnes, Gervasius, and Protasius.²⁰ The fact that these saints are absent from inscriptions before the coming of Vandals is not surprising. The epigraphic evidence of religious phenomena is quite often delayed. In Egypt, for instance, the cult of saints is absent, too, from the fourth-century epigraphic (and papyrological) evidence.²¹ Had we not the literary sources, we would think that it started only in the following century and this, of course, would be untrue. Certainly, this delay is not without significance. It seems that the emergence of epigraphic testimonia to the phenomenon

¹⁸ Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis* III 14, 49, p. 52.

¹⁹ Dracontius, *Satisfactio* I 151-174 – ed. F. SPERANZA, *Blossi Dracontii Aemilii Satisfactio*, Roma, 1978, p. 21.

²⁰ Augustine's sermons for (or mentions of) the feast of Peter and Paul: *Sermo* 8, 15 – ed. C. LAMBOT, Turnhout, 1961 (*CC SL*, 41), p. 92; *Sermo* 279 – ed. G. MORIN, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 1, Rome, 1930, p. 593; *Sermones* 295-299, *PL* 38, cols. 1348-1376; *sermo* 381, *PL* 39, cols. 1683-1684; *Sermo* 299 A (=S. Dolbeau 4D) – ed. F. DOLBEAU in Augustin d'Hippone, *Vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique*, Paris, 1996, pp. 511-520; Stephen: *Sermones* 314-324, *PL* 38, cols. 1425-1447; Vincent: *Sermones* 274-277, *PL* 38, cols. 1252-1268; *Sermo* 277A – ed. G. Morin, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 1, pp. 243-245; Lawrence: *In Iohannis euangelium tractatus* 27, 12 – ed. R. WILLEMS, Turnhout, 1950 (*CC SL*, 36), p. 276; *Sermo* 302 – ed. C. LAMBOT, Brussels, 1950 (*Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia*, 1), pp. 100-106; *Sermones* 303-305, *PL* 38, cols. 1393-1400; *Sermo* 305A – ed. G. MORIN, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 1, Rome, 1930, pp. 55-64, Agnes: *Sermo* 273, 6, *PL* 38, cols. 1250-1251; Gervasius and Protasius: *Sermo* 286, *PL* 38, cols. 1297-1301.

²¹ See the evidence collected by A. PAPAConstantinou, *Le culte des saints en Egypte: des Byzantins aux Abbassides: l'apport des inscriptions et des papyrus grecs et coptes*, Paris, 2001.

after 429 shows that only then had it attained a critical mass, but there is no doubt that it had started before: Peter, Paul, Stephen, Lawrence, Vincent, and Agnes were venerated in Africa before the invasion.

3. *Why were the Overseas Saints Attractive?*

Still more important is that even if we assume that the popularity of overseas, and especially Roman saints, grew in the Vandal period, we should ask about the origins of this popularity. Why did these and not other saints become worshipped widely throughout Africa? Were they especially suitable to mark the attachment of local Christians to the Catholic case? Since, in the eyes of fifth-century African Christians, Rome undoubtedly personified orthodoxy, the Roman saints, and above all Peter and Paul, seem to fit this pattern. However, in this period, Rome actively promoted the cult of its super-saints everywhere and Africa was not exceptional from this point of view.²² In Gaul, inscriptions and literary sources bear witness to the growing role of foreign, mainly Roman, martyrs about the same time as in Africa.²³ Perhaps even more revealing is the case of Asia Minor. Here, the situation in Late Antiquity was different than in the western provinces. Anatolia, too, was a scene of religious conflicts, but it did not fall victim to barbarian (and Arian) invasions and thus it does not fit well with the pattern of the oppressed local Christians looking to mark their unity with the Church of the empire. And yet we can observe the same phenomenon as occurred in Africa: local martyrs were present on inscriptions already in the fourth century whereas great foreign saints appear only in the fifth and even more so in the sixth century.²⁴

Actually, the mechanisms that helped spread the cult of specific saints throughout the Roman world are usually quite understandable and not related directly to religious conflicts. With reference to the biblical personages whose popularity in Vandal Africa is attested by inscriptions and the Calendar of Carthage, it seems that they were just the most fashionable saints in this period. Their relics had been recently discovered, translated, or deposited in new churches which, as a result, quickly began to attract pilgrims from the whole of the Mediterranean region. This was the

²² See DUVAL, *Loca Sanctorum Africae*, vol. II, p. 634.

²³ See B. BEAUJARD, *Le culte des saints en Gaule. Les premiers temps. D'Hilaire de Poitiers à la fin du VI^e siècle*, Paris, 2000, pp. 126-127 and passim.

²⁴ See P. NOWAKOWSKI, "Diffusion and Functions of the Cult of saints in Asia Minor up to the End of the 6th c. (the Epigraphic Evidence)", in *Proceedings of the International Conference: Die Christianisierung Kleinasiens in der Spätantike. University of Cologne 18-22 March 2013* – ed. W. AMELING (forthcoming).

case with Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, whose remains, brought to Constantinople in 356-357, were visited there by several Western visitors and whose (most probably contact) relics became very popular and sought after in Italy and Gaul at the turn of the fifth century.²⁵ This was also the case with the Three Youth whose bodies were discovered probably in 422 and transferred to Constantinople during the reign of Leo I.²⁶ It was the same with John the Baptist. During the reign of Julian his ashes were transferred from Sebaste to Jerusalem and then to Alexandria, the first of his heads found its way to Constantinople and the second was later discovered in Emesa.²⁷ It was so with James, the Lord's brother, whose grave was probably (re)discovered in Jerusalem in the fourth century.²⁸ It was certainly so with Stephen who became the most renowned of the foreign saints whose cult arrived to Africa in the fifth century. It is doubtful if he attained this status because he was an ideal champion of Catholicity. It was rather because his relics which were brought to Africa shortly after their discovery in 415, were the first miracle-working relics in this part of the world. At the beginning of the fifth century, the martyrs' graves in Africa were numerous and frequently visited for religious purposes, but nothing suggests that any of them was considered to be a source of any special power. Moreover, still in 404, Augustine, when enumerating miracles at martyrs' tombs in Italy, directly said that in Africa such things simply did not happen.²⁹ It was the arrival of Stephen's relics that changed this situation. Some of these relics

²⁵ Translation: Jerome, *Chronica*, s.a. 356/357 – ed. R. HELM, Berlin, 1956 (GCS 47), p. 240. Their relics in the West: Gaudentius, *Tractatus*, 17, 11 – ed. A. GLÜCK, Vienna, 1936 (CSEL, 68), p. 144; Chromatius of Aquileia, *Sermo* 26 – ed. J. LEMARIÉ, Turnhout, 1976 (CC SL, 9A), p. 119-122; Paulinus of Nola, *Ep.* 32, 17; *Martyrologium Hieronymianum*: 9 May and 27 November – ed. G.B. DE ROSSI – L. DUCHESNE, Brussels, 1894 (*Acta Sanctorum Novembris*, vol. II 1) p. 57 and 147; Victricius of Rouen, *De laude sanctorum* 6 – ed. R. DEMEULENAERE, Turnhout, 1985 (CC SL, 64), p. 78.

²⁶ See G. GARITTE, "L'invention géorgienne des trois enfants de Babylone", *Le Muséon*, 72 (1959), pp. 69-100, their relics transferred to Constantinople during the reign of Leo I (457-474): *Vita Danielis* 92; see E. CRONNIER, *Les inventions des reliques dans l'Empire byzantin (IV^e-VII^e s.)* (diss. Paris I-Sorbonne) 2012, pp. 52-60.

²⁷ The first head: Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VII 21 – ed. J. BIDEZ – G.C. HANSEN, Paris, 2008 (SC, 516), pp. 178-184; cf. Theodoret, *Historia Ecclesiastica* III 7 – ed. L. PARMENTIER, Berlin, 1954 (GCS, 19), pp. 182-183; *Chronicon Paschale*, s.a. 391 – ed. L. DINDORF, Bonn, 1832 (CSHB, 11), p. 564; the second head: *Chronicon Paschale*, s.a. 453, p. 591; Marcellinus Comes, *Chronicon*, s.a. 453 – ed. Th. MOMMSEN, Berlin, 1894 (MGH AA, 11), p. 84.

²⁸ The narration on the discovery of his tomb (BHL 4099) was edited as "Apparitio sanctorum Jacobi apostoli et primi archiepiscoporum, atque sacerdotum Symonis et Zachariae", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 9 (1889), pp. 123-124. See E. CRONNIER, *Les inventions de reliques*, pp. 65-80.

²⁹ Augustine, *Ep.* 78, 3 – ed. A. GOLDBACHER, Vienna, 1898 (CSEL, 34, 2), p. 335.

were brought to Africa by Orosius and deposited in at least three churches, in Uzalis, Calama and Hippo, after solemn, processional transfers.³⁰ These translations, which attracted crowds, were probably the first ceremonies of this kind in Africa and they offered a promising beginning to the cult of St. Stephen in this region and shortly after his relics gained renown for their miraculous cures. This process was especially swift as the cures were much advertised. Augustine made people who regained their health give written witness accounts (*libelli*) of the grace they received. The miracles which happened in Hippo were publicized in book twenty-two of the *City of God* and those from Uzalis found expression in *Liber de miraculis sancti Stephani*, the oldest collection of miracles known to us. This was an important and new phenomenon and a real source of the popularity of the cult of St. Stephen. It had been already developing extremely quickly before the coming of the Vandals, but since his relics arrived to Africa only about ten years before the invasion, there is little wonder that the epigraphic evidence to his cult came from the period after 429.

It is interesting to note that in the period in which the cult of new overseas saints was growing stronger, there seems to be no substantial change in the set of the local saints worshipped in Africa. Although there were victims of Vandal persecution who were remembered and celebrated in narrative texts and even presented as martyrs, we do not see any certain signs of their regular cult. At least a part of the explanation may lay in the fact that those whom the Vandals actually killed were quite few in number. This can be seen even in the grim narration of Victor of Vita.³¹ If we are to trust him, the Vandals were afraid that the cult of new martyrs could easily emerge among the Roman population within their kingdom and it was this fear that prevented bloodshed.³² Be that as it may, there are no inscriptions which could be safely classified as commemorating the martyrs of the Vandal persecution, no calendar entries and no literary mentions of their feasts or sanctuaries. It is true that later on, we find evidence of the cult of Quodvultdeus of Carthage and Gaudiosus of Abitina, both of whom were

³⁰ For Uzalis see *Liber de miraculis sancti Stephani* – ed. J. MEYERS, in *Les miracles de saint Étienne. Recherches sur le recueil pseudo-augustinien* (BHL 7860-7861), Turnhout, 2006, pp. 266-355; for Calama, Hippo and Uzalis: Augustine, *De civitate* XXII 8 – ed. B. DOMBART – A. KALB, Turnhout, 1955 (CC SL, 48), pp. 821-827.

³¹ See D. SHANZER, "Intentions and Audiences: History, Hagiography, Martyrdom, and Confession in Victor of Vita's *Historia persecutionis*", in *Vandals, Romans and Berbers*, pp. 271-290, esp. pp. 278-286.

³² Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis* I 14, 44, p. 11.

regarded as victims of the Vandal persecution, but they had been exiled, not killed, and their cult developed only in Campania and not in Africa.³³

All in all, traces are extremely weak of the anti-Arian or anti-Vandal character of the set of saints venerated in Africa. The evolution of the sanctoral is noticeable, but it can be perfectly explained by factors not related to theological conflict. Moreover, a militant character of the list of saints worshipped by Catholics would have made sense only if the opposite faction had rejected their cult, which – as I will show – was not the case.

4. *Vandals and the Cults of Saints*

As for the other side of the conflict, there is no evidence whatsoever of the cult of specifically Vandal, or more generally Arian, saints. This could result from three reasons. First, we have no good sources. Second, the Vandals disliked the cult of saints in general. Third, they simply did not differ in this respect from Catholics. Plausible as they may seem, these reasons are only hypothetical and have to be critically examined.

As to the first point, one has to admit that, when invading Africa, the Vandals actually did not have any habits of writing. However, they ultimately acquired them, and although their visible presence in literature and epigraphy is not strong, the lack of sources itself does not seem to be a satisfying explanation of the lack of Vandal saints, especially as their religious behaviours were mentioned by Catholic authors.³⁴

It is hardly possible either that the Vandals were not interested at all in the cult of saints. At least nothing suggests an intrinsic Arian hostility toward this phenomenon.³⁵ Actually, it is evident that Arians did worship saints. That their beliefs and religious practices in this respect did not differ from those of the Nicenes can be seen in the case of the Goths. I am referring to them not because they, like the Vandals, were a Germanic people, but because like them, they were Arian newcomers to the Empire which was inhabited mostly by the Nicene Christians and because we know their attitude toward the cult of saints better than that of Roman or Greek Arians.

³³ See J.P. CONANT, "Europe and the African Cult of Saints, 350-900: An Essay in European Communications", *Speculum*, 85 (2010), pp. 1-46, at pp. 1-2.

³⁴ Vandalic inscriptions, see: COURTOIS, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, pp. 219-222 and Appendix II.

³⁵ A. SAMELLAS, *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50-600 AD)*, Tübingen, 2002, p. 172, takes seriously Jerome's remark (*Contra Vigilantium* 8 – ed. J.L. FEIERTAG, Turnhout, 2005 (CC SL, 79C), p. 19) about Eunomians rejecting the cult of saints. Jerome's argument, however, is purely rhetorical: by comparing his enemy with Eunomius and Porphyrius Jerome matched him with the worst heretic and pagan a good Christian was able to imagine. Nothing can be said about Eunomius' actual attitude toward the cult of saints.

There is no doubt that it was a positive attitude as it is well proven by the remains of the Ostrogoth calendar with saints' feasts.³⁶ Moreover, there are examples of barbarian and Arian commanders who were actively devoted to saints. The Gothic magister militum Gainas, for instance, prayed at the relics of John the Baptist and it is possible that the Alan and Arian family of Ardaburi was involved in a transfer of relics to Constantinople.³⁷ Finally, we know that there were specific Arian saints, and the cult of least one of them, Artemios, managed to overcome the confessional barrier and gain popularity in Nicene Constantinople.³⁸

There remains a third solution – that we do not see a specific Vandal cult of saints in our sources, because Vandals worshipped the same saints as other African Christians. In fact, this explanation should be accepted not only because the others have been excluded, but because we have a few direct arguments quite forcefully proving its veracity.³⁹ First, according to Victor of Vita, the Vandals deprived 'Catholics' of Carthaginian basilicas with the graves of Cyprian, Perpetua and Felicitas, and Scillitan Martyrs, all of whom belonged to the most famous African saints.⁴⁰ Perhaps it would be too hasty to conclude that what the Vandals cared about was precisely the relics and not the basilicas themselves. Yet Victor of Vita, who normally is only too eager to charge Vandals with any sacrilege, does not suggest that these relics were dishonoured in any way. Moreover, and this is the

³⁶ Text and English translation: P. HEATHER – J. MATTHEWS, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, Liverpool, 1991 (Translated Texts for Historians, 11), pp. 120-122.

³⁷ Gainas: Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VIII 4, 14 – ed. J. BIDEZ – G.C. HANSEN, Paris, 2008, SC, 516, p. 254) Ardaburi: *Vita Marciani*, 16 – ed. J. WORTLEY, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 103 (2010), pp. 753-754; see: R. SNEE, "Gregory Nazianzen's Anastasia Church: Arianism, the Goths, and Hagiography", *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 52 (1998), pp. 157-186.

³⁸ Artemios, *dux* of Egypt, was sentenced to death by Julian. The victims of Julian's persecution included at least three bishops, namely: George of Cappadocia, bishop of Alexandria, Patrophilus of Scythopolis, and Dorotheus of Tyre. They were named in late fourth-century anonymous Arian homoean history reconstituted from quotations in later authors, see BIDEZ, *Philostorgius*, cli-cliii, and for the English translation of the relevant passages: Philostorgius, *Church History*, tr. Ph.R. Amidon, Atlanta 2007, App. 7, 33c-34d. The cult of Dorotheus is subsequently attested in the Gothic calendar, mentioned above. For the history of the cult of Artemios see J.W. NESBITT, "Introduction" in *The Miracles of St. Artemios. A Collection of Miracle Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh-Century Byzantium*, Leiden, 1997, pp. 1-7.

³⁹ Unfortunately the onomastic is of no help for this study. We do not know any Vandal named after a saint, which is quite understandable giving the scarceness of the evidence (and the strong tradition of giving children Vandalic names), see COURTOIS, *Les Vandales et l'Afrique*, pp. 365-388, and remarks of N. DUVAL, "Observations sur l'onomastique dans les inscriptions chrétiennes d'Afrique du Nord", in *L'onomastique latine. Paris, 13-15 Octobre*, 1975, Paris, 1977, pp. 447-456, at p. 452.

⁴⁰ Victor of Vita, *Historia persecutionis* I 3, 9, pp. 3-4.

second point, when Belisarius recaptured Carthage in 533, Romans found the basilica of St. Cyprian prepared for the liturgy, because just before the attack, Arian priests were busied to make the shrine ready for the celebration of the feast of St. Cyprian.⁴¹ Third, the anonymous author of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*, who possibly can be identified as the Arian bishop Maximinus, equates the Nicenes with false prophets, because they seem to administer the same sacraments and worship the same Apostles and martyrs as the true believers. The implicit meaning of this warning is clear: Nicenes and Arians do not differ from each other in this respect.⁴² Fourth, the only Vandalic (most likely) inscription related to the cult of saints was ordered by a certain Hegerit in honour of St. Felix who should probably be identified as Felix of Thibiuca, a perfectly local African martyr of the Diocletianic persecution.⁴³

Certainly one has to be cautious here. Actually, only in the case of the basilicas in Carthage do our sources explicitly identify Vandals and Arians and, even here, it is possible that initially it was African Romans converted to Arianism who cared for and strived to take over of the tomb of St. Cyprian and other renowned local saints. As for Hegerit, we cannot exclude that he was a Catholic. As for the author of the *Opus imperfectum*, when speaking of Arians worshipping the same saints as Nicenes, he could have had in mind mostly Romans, not Vandals. As I have said, the border between the two camps in the African Christianity was sometimes blurred. The Arian Church there had generally an ethnic character, but there were Roman Arians as well as Vandal Catholics.⁴⁴ These groups were probably marginal, but they certainly played a role in the transmission of particular saints' cults – because those who changed their religious allegiance did not have any reasons to abandon the saints whom they used to worship. And it seems that this transmission was effective.

It should be added that there is no evidence either to an erstwhile vision of African refugees taking away relics of African martyrs and bringing them across the Mediterranean.⁴⁵ Nothing suggests that anybody wanted to save holy bones from the Vandals. Actually, the attitude of the Vandals toward

⁴¹ Procopius, *Bella* III 21, 21-25 – eds. E. Capps – T.E. Page – W.H.D. Rouse, London – New York, 1916 (Loeb Classical Library, 81) pp. 180-184.

⁴² *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* 48, 11, PG 56, col. 905; for Maximinus see: M. Meslin, *Les Ariens d'Occident*, Paris, 1967, 174-180, contra: F.W. Schlatter, "The Author of the *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*", *Vigiliae Christianae*, 42 (1988), pp. 364-375. See also Modéran, "Une guerre de religion", pp. 36-37.

⁴³ Duval, *Loca Sanctorum Africae*, no. 13.

⁴⁴ See J. Conant, *Staying Roman. Conquest and Identity in Africa and the Mediterranean, 439-700*, Cambridge, 2012, pp. 194-195.

⁴⁵ See Conant, "Europe and the African Cult of Saints", p. 2 and passim.

Catholic saints seems to be entirely approving, quite similar to that of the Goths. The fragments of the calendar used by the latter demonstrate that they both venerated great 'universal' saints, such as the Apostles Philip and Andrew, and adopted very local cults which they encountered on their way through the empire. The best example of the latter is a liturgical commemoration of the Forty Old Women Martyrs of Beroia in Thrace, which the Goths certainly took over when they lived for a time in this province.

Certainly, this calendar also shows that the Goths had their own saints as well. Out of the seven feasts named in the calendar, of which only one month is extant, two are commemorations of Gothic martyrs who were victims of the persecution which preceded Christianisation and one is devoted to the Arian bishop Dorotheus. This does not end the list of Gothic saints that we know about; the most famous of whom was the martyr Sabas.⁴⁶ The Vandals, however, differed from Goths in this respect: they did not have their own martyrs. This was caused by historical reasons. Although the circumstances of their Christianisation are unclear, nothing suggests that this process met resistance. There was simply no persecution and thus there were no 'national' martyrs either.

5. *Conclusions*

The Vandals had no ethnic martyrs to venerate and there is no proof that they were attached to other Arian saints. Perhaps they had pious bishops and maybe even monks renowned for their sanctity, but we simply do not know about them. The Catholics, on the other hand, had their own particular martyrs who were victims of the Vandal persecution, but we cannot see traces of their cult, which suggests that it was not very strong, if it existed at all. There were some changes in the body of saints worshipped in Africa during the century of Vandal reign, but they seem to result from wider trends observable in the whole of the Mediterranean and not from local religious conflict. However, we should not conclude that the cult of saints did not play any role in this conflict. Saints were important for both sides, but the point was not to promote one's own martyr, but rather to enter into possession of a sanctuary of an already famous saint. That seems to be one of the characteristics of Vandal religious policy.

It seems that this situation was not different from what we can observe in other inter-Christian conflicts of Late Antiquity, above all in the Monophysite controversy. The sides of this conflict rarely produced their own

⁴⁶ See the sources collected by HEATHER and MATTHEWS, *The Goths in the Fourth Century*, pp. 96-123.

saints: there are very few specifically Chalcedonian or Monophysite saints. Yet there were Chalcedonian and Monophysite sanctuaries.⁴⁷ The same phenomenon can be observed in Spain under Visigothic rule. We know about a conflict between the Nicenes and Arians over the sanctuary of saint Eulalia in Merida.⁴⁸ In Africa the situation was similar.

The temptation arises to go farther and ask whether the fact that a saint's sanctuary was controlled by Catholic or Arians strengthened his or her cult in respective groups. Were Vandals more devoted to St. Cyprian, whose tomb they had in their church, than to other saints? Or does the fact that 'Catholics' seem attached to St. Stephen suggest that the Vandals did not hold this saint's shrines? Unfortunately, the evidence does not allow us to answer those questions.

Summary

The article's aim is to demonstrate that in the fifth and sixth centuries, the conflicting religious groups in Africa – Arian Vandals and Nicene Romans – did not use the cult of specific saints to strengthen and express their respective identities as it has been often assumed in the scholarship. In this period, changes in the set of saints venerated in Africa took place and the cult of foreign saints developed especially quickly. Yet nothing suggests a causal link between Vandal religious policy and these changes and even their chronological association is dubious. Nothing proves that the Vandals worshiped their proper saints either. It seems that both sides of the conflict venerated the same apostles and martyrs and the evolution of the sanctoral in Africa followed the same patterns that can be observed in other parts of the Mediterranean. It does not mean that the cult of saints did not play any role in the conflict, but that the struggle was over possessing sanctuaries of renowned martyrs rather than over promoting one's own saints.

⁴⁷ See e.g. E.K. FOWDEN, *The Barbarian Plain. Saint Sergius Between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1999 for Rusafa; J. GASCOU, "Les Origines du culte de saints Cyr et Jean", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 125 (2007), pp. 241-281 for Menouthis.

⁴⁸ *Vitae sanctorum patrum emeretensium* 5,5 – ed. A. MAYA-SANCHEZ, Turnhout, 1992 (CC SL, 116), pp. 56-62.

Homilia in Pentecosten (CPG 6665): A Sermon of Basil of Seleucia

Richard W. BISHOP

(*Leuven*)

In 1940 Benedikt Marx published, as an appendix to his *Procliana: Untersuchung über den homiletischen Nachlass des Patriarchen Proklos von Konstantinopel*, the Greek text of a previously unedited sermon from the patristic era on the Feast of Pentecost. On the basis of rather meager internal arguments, Marx attributed the sermon to Proclus of Constantinople, the fifth-century bishop and noted homilist. Preferring instead the attribution of a number of manuscripts which Marx chose to set aside, the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG) has placed the sermon not among the works of Proclus, but rather among the works of another fifth-century bishop and homilist, namely, Basil of Seleucia. The CPG's classification has been confirmed by Johannes Marius Tevel, who made an exhaustive study of the manuscript tradition of Basil's corpus.¹

Marx had noticed that the sermon in question, to which the CPG assigns the number 6665, shares a small block of material in common with another Pentecost sermon, Pseudo-Chrysostom *In Pentecosten sermo* 2 (PG 52:807-809; CPG 4537). Neither Marx nor anyone else appears to have noticed in print that the final third of CPG 6665 is also preserved in somewhat amplified form in a sermon of Ephrem Graecus, the name assigned to the

¹ Benedikt Marx, *Procliana: Untersuchung über den homiletischen Nachlass des Patriarchen Proklos von Konstantinopel* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 23; Münster: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1940) 100-102 (text), 97, 48-49 (comment); the sermon is number 41 in Marx's numbering system, "14" on p. 48 being a typo; Mauritijs Geerard, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum: Volumen III; A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979) 6665; no additional information about the sermon is contained in the two volumes of updates: Maritijs Geerard and Jacques Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum: Supplementum* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) and Jacques Noret, *Clavis Patrum Graecorum: Volumen IIIA; A Cyrillo Alexandrino ad Iohannem Damascenum; Addenda volumini III* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003); Johannes Marius Tevel, *De Preken van Basilius van Seleucië: Handschriftelijke overlevering—Editie van vier preken* (Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam: Utrecht: Elinkwijk, 1990) 94-98. Cf. also J. A. de Aldama, *Repertorium pseudochrysostomicum* (Documents, études et répertoires X; Paris: Éditions du centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1965) no. 449.

vast assemblage of Greek homiletical literature attributed to the famous fourth-century poet, homilist, and commentator of the Syriac-speaking world, Ephrem of Edessa. The sermon of Ephrem Graecus, CPG 4061, is entitled *Encomium in Petrum et Paulum et Andream, Thomam et Lucam et Ioannem, et in lectionem euangelii secundum Ioannem*.² The purpose of this article is to supplement the external evidence for Basilian authorship of CPG 6665 with internal evidence and to determine, to the extent possible, the relationship between the three sermons mentioned so far: CPG 6665, 4537, and 4061. To this list should be added a fourth sermon, CPG 6666, which is the other Pentecost sermon attributed to Basil of Seleucia and which is related not only to CPG 6665, but also to 4537. Because it is difficult to address the authorship of CPG 6665 independently of 6666, a demonstration of the Basilian authorship of 6666 on the basis of internal evidence is included as an appendix to this article.³

1. *The Authorship of CPG 6665*

Marx begins his argument for the Proclan authorship of CPG 6665 by observing that while Proclus is known to have taken over material from the sermons of other preachers, Basil is not. This argument assumes that CPG 6665 depends on 4537 and not the other way around, but in any case in his exemplary and erudite edition of Basil's *Homilia in resurrectionem domini* (CPG 6664), Michel Aubineau has documented Basil's extensive use of a sermon attributed to the very same Proclus.⁴ Hence, *pace* Marx, Basil was perfectly capable of taking over material from other authors. Marx goes on to adduce several alleged parallels with works attributed to Proclus, but the

² The sermon was first published by Joseph Assemani, *S(ancti) P(atris) N(ostri) Ephraem Syri opera omnia quae exstant graece, syriace, latine, in sex tomos distributa*, (Rome: Typographia Pontificia Vaticana, 1732-1746) 3:462^c-470. It has been republished, with a translation into modern Greek in Konstantinos G. Phrantzolas, *Ὁσίων Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα*, vol. 7 (Thessalonica: To Perivoli tis Panagias, 1998) 112-130. Phrantzolas gives the title as Ἐγκώμιον εἰς Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν, Θωμᾶν τε καὶ Λουκᾶν καὶ Ἰωάννην· καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν Θωμᾶ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην Εὐαγγελίου.

³ This article is thus technically focused and to some extent leaves to the side other important issues, such as the theology, rhetoric, and liturgical setting of the sermons in question, as well as the broader tradition of Pentecost preaching, except where these issues are relevant to the purposes of the article.

⁴ Aubineau, Michel, ed., *Homélies pascales: cinq homélies inédites*. Sources chrétiennes 187 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1972) 169-277, here 181-186, which shows that Basil made liberal use of a homily attributed to Proclus of Constantinople (*In S. Pascha*, PG 65:800-805; CPG 5814). The Latin title of this sermon preferred by Aubineau is *Homilia in S. Pascha*, but the CPG, perhaps to avoid confusion with two similarly titled sermons of Basil, uses the title I follow above.

passages he cites do not bear the weight he places on them. He puts forward, for example, a comparison between the catalogue of feasts in CPG 6665 and festal catalogues found in the third oration of Proclus (CPG 5802) and in the sermon *In ascensionem sermo 4* of Pseudo-Chrysostom (CPG 4534), which Marx also attributes to Proclus on grounds no more stable than those he supplies for CPG 6665.⁵ There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the third oration of Proclus, but neither alleged parallel stands up to close scrutiny: the specific vocabulary used to describe the feasts in these passages does not match 6665 at all. If anything a comparison of these three catalogues (i.e., CPG 6665, 5802, and 4534; the length of the passages involved precludes a detailed demonstration here) suggests that they were not composed by the same author. Marx next cites the description in CPG 6665 of the apostles' miraculous ability to cure lameness: πόδας μὲν ἐκ τῆς πῆρας τοῖς χωλοῖς ἐδανείζετε (Marx 102, 1). As a parallel, he adduces PG 65:821b: ἐν Ἀύστροις τῷ χωλῷ ἡρεύξατο πόδας. There is some shared vocabulary here (πόδας, χωλός), but that might be accounted for by the association of the two words in the underlying scriptural text (Acts 14:8-10); the distinctive element here is the verb and that is different in both cases. Marx next cites an extended metaphor found in CPG 6665, where the apostles are the light of the world "of which Christ is the lamp, the cross the lampstand, and the supply of the Spirit the oil."⁶ He adduces PG 50:815 as a parallel, where the Old and New Testaments are a boat, the cross a rudder, Christ the pilot, the Father the captain, the wind the Spirit, the sail grace, the apostles sailors, and the prophets the marines. This is simply an extended metaphor; Christ, the cross, and the Spirit are mentioned in each passage, but the rather different terms of comparison make this alleged parallel less than persuasive. Finally Marx mentions the contrast between above and below, which is supposed to be typical of Proclus. The contrast between above and below, however, is so widespread in patristic homiletical literature that its value as a parallel is very little without further specification.⁷

Although the specific passages that Marx adduces are hardly persuasive of Proclan authorship for CPG 6665, he does raise two points that might seem to tell against Basilian authorship. The first point is that the sermon

⁵ Marx, *Untersuchung*, no. 38, pp. 45-46.

⁶ οὗ λύχνος ὁ Χριστός, λυχνία δὲ ὁ σταυρός, ἔλαιον ἡ χορηγία τοῦ Πνεύματος (Marx 101, 22-23). See further remarks on this sentence below at p. 151.

⁷ In this case, though it need not indicate direct dependence, a closer parallel can be found in the Ascension sermon of Chrysostom: ὑμῖν γὰρ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χορηγίας τὴν ἄνω καὶ τὴν κάτω βασιλείαν ἐπίστευσεν (Marx 101, 18-19) // οἱ μὲν δὲ τῆς κάτω ἀρχῆς ὄντες ἄξιοι, πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνέβημεν τὴν ἄνω (Chrysostom, *In ascensionem domini nostri Jesu Christi*; CPG 4342; PG 50:445, 2-3).

is half the length of the other liturgical homilies attributed to Basil. The relatively uniform length of Basil's other liturgical homilies does suggest a homiletical habit, but there might have been occasion, such as having more than one sermon on the day in question, for Basil to preach for a shorter time than appears to have been his custom. The second point concerns Basil's style, which Marx characterizes as excessive and overblown, while the style of CPG 6665 seems comparatively unadorned. Comparison of CPG 6665 with, for example, 6666 suggests that there is some truth to this observation of Marx's, though some of the differences in point of style might be accounted for by the relative brevity of CPG 6665. In any case, however, it is difficult to assess the evidentiary value of such subjective judgments in the absence of a goodly supply of specific examples illustrating Basil's supposed style and CPG 6665's departure from it, but such a supply is not forthcoming from Marx's pen.⁸

An additional point meriting consideration here is comparison of the scriptural usage of CPG 6665 and 6666. In the first place it should be noted that neither sermon refers to the reading or singing of specific portions of Scripture; hence on the basis of the sermons themselves, we cannot know for certain the readings of the respective feast days, though as will emerge from this survey of scriptural usage, the likeliest candidates are some portion of Acts 2 and Gen 11:1-9. Secondly, each sermon contains a number of scriptural citations or allusions not found in the other. For example, the miracles of Peter and Paul described in Acts 5:15 and 19:11-12 respectively are alluded to in CPG 6665, but not in 6666. The final section of CPG 6665, which it shares in common with 4061, contains a number of allusions not found in CPG 6666: Gal 3:5 and Phil 1:19; Matt 5:13; Matt 5:14; Matt 10:10 [and parallels]; Matt 14:29; Matt. 10:19; Acts 3:6-7 and 14:8-10; Acts 19:12 and Matt 9:20; Matt 13:44; Luke 15:8; Matt 13:47; 1 Pet. 2:6 and Eph 2:20.⁹ Similarly, a number of allusions or citations present in CPG 6666 are absent in 6665. For example, Johannine texts (John 14:18, 16; 16:12) are cited in CPG 6666, but not in CPG 6665, though both sermons do employ the Johannine title for the Spirit, Paraclete. Three public feasts of the Old Testament (Pascha, Pentecost, Tabernacles) are discussed in CPG 6666, but not in 6665. The descent of the Spirit in the form of a dove at Jesus's baptism is mentioned in CPG

⁸ Though he does not comment on CPG 6665, which had not yet been published, the most extensive treatment of Basil's style remains Fridericus Fenner, *De Basilio Seleucensi questiones selectae* (diss., Marburg: Typis Caroli Georgi Bonnensis, 1912).

⁹ To anticipate the conclusions of this article, there is some reason to think that the block of material found in this section of CPG 6665 and in 4061 is original to neither author. Hence the presence of these allusions in CPG 6665 and their absence in 6666 is of relatively little importance for the authorship of either CPG 6665 or 6666.

6666, but not in 6665, though the latter sermon does refer to the Feast of Epiphany. The giving of the Law at Sinai comes up for discussion in CPG 6666, but not in 6665. And finally, the accusation of apostolic drunkenness (Acts 2:13,15) is addressed in CPG 6666, but not in 6665. Hence there is a certain amount of variation in this scriptural usage.

On the other hand, the miracles described in Acts 2 are prominent in both sermons, as indeed they are in nearly every other Pentecost sermon that has come down to us from Late Antiquity. In addition, both sermons give some attention to the incident at the tower of Babel, though CPG 6665 is the only sermon of this pair to cite the scriptural text explicitly (Gen 11:7).¹⁰ There are, moreover, some apparent differences between CPG 6665 and 6666 when it comes to their respective explanations of the relationship between Babel and Pentecost. In CPG 6666 we read, rather conventionally, that prior to the construction of the tower of Babel, there was a single language, but as punishment for their audacity, God divided the language of the people at that time, and a conflict of tongues ensued such that they could no longer understand each other. At Pentecost the Holy Spirit graciously distributed tongues, gathering, as it were, the languages together for the expansion of the faith. A similar narrative is briefly recounted in CPG 6665, but in contrast to the confusion of tongues at Babel, the sermon appeals particularly to the division of tongues in Acts 2:3-4. These divided tongues of Pentecost corrected the confused tongues of Babel. Hence in CPG 6666, the division of tongues at Babel and their collection at Pentecost is emphasized; in CPG 6665 the confusion of tongues at Babel and their correction through division at Pentecost is emphasized. Could the same author have penned both these interpretations? This discrepancy may be less than it appears. There is a difference

¹⁰ Though not as prevalent as discussion of Acts 2, the confusion of tongues at the tower of Babel makes an appearance in several patristic and early-Byzantine Pentecost sermons. See Robert Cabié, *La Pentecôte: L'évolution de la Cinquantaine Pascale au cours des cinq premiers siècles* (Tournai: Desclée, 1965) 228-32, who cites, from the Greek sermons, CPG 3010 (Gregory of Nazianzus) and CPG 4343.2 (Pseudo-Chrysostom). The theme also occurs in Homily 25 of Severus of Antioch (*Patrologia Orientalis* 37/1:146-167) and, most notably for our purposes, in CPG 4537, 6665, and 6666. On the Pentecost material of Severus, see Pauline Allen, "The Pentecost Feast in Sixth-Century Antioch: The Evidence of Patriarch Severus (512-518)" forthcoming in *Preaching after Easter: Studies in Late Antique Sermons on the Feasts of Ascension and Pentecost*. In her article "Ecrire du Chrysostome : l'exemple de l'homélie 2 *Sur la Pentecôte* (CPG 4343.2)" in the same volume, Nathalie Rambault demonstrates the inauthenticity of CPG 4343.2, hitherto widely accepted as an authentic Pentecost sermon of Chrysostom's. Rambault builds on the observations of S. J. Voicu "L'immagine di Crisostomo negli spuri" in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren : Facetten der Wirkungs-geschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, M. Wallraff and R. Brande, eds. (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 105; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008) 61-98.

on the level of verbal analysis, but the respective interpretations remain broadly congruent. Babel was in both sermons a linguistic catastrophe that resulted in the inability of people to understand one another; Pentecost was a linguistic miracle that remedied the language barrier and thus facilitated the spread of the gospel.

While these three points give one some pause in assessing the authorship of CPG 6665, the external and internal evidence in favor of Basilian authorship of the sermon is far more persuasive. The external evidence, which Tevel has assessed, will not be rehearsed here. The internal evidence, and associated questions, is the focus of the remainder of this article.

In assessing the content of CPG 6665 with a view to determining whether Basil of Seleucia composed it, it will be well to consider the sermon in three parts: the first part (Marx 100, 4-101, 2; together with the little bridge between the second and third parts, 101, 11-17); the second part (Marx 101, 3-10), which is a kind of litany on the twelve apostles that the sermon shares in common with CPG 4537; and the third and final part of the sermon (Marx 101, 11-102, 15), which also occurs in amplified form at the beginning of CPG 4061. The purpose of the analysis below is to identify verbal parallels or examine other points of comparison between Basil's larger corpus and the three parts of CPG 6665.

a. Internal Evidence: Part One of CPG 6665

For part one of CPG 6665, a number of parallels are adduced below with minimal comment. Included here with the reference in bold are parallels with CPG 6666, the authenticity of which is defended in an appendix to this article.

Πυκνὰ μὲν ἡμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐπωφελῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ πνευματικὰ θεάτρα (Marx 100, 4-5) // Διὰ τοῦτο τῶ πνευματικῶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας θεάτρῳ, χαίροντες οἱ εὐαγγελισταὶ τὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἀπαγγέλλουσιν θαύματα (Cunningham 2, 12-14).¹¹ Cf.: Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν θεάτρον ἀγγέλων τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπικοινωνοῦν εἰπὼν τις, οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι, θεάτρον, ἐν ᾧ Χριστὸς παρὰ τε τῆς ἀοράτου φύσεως καὶ ὁρατῆς εὐφημεῖται, θεάτρον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ δεσποτικὰ θαύματα ἄσματα τερπνὰ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἐξυφαίνεται (Cunningham 1, 1-5); Ἀλλ' οὐ τοιοῦτον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸ θεάτρον (Cunningham 2, 1).

¹¹ M. Cunningham, "Basil of Seleucia's homily on Lazarus: a new edition (BHG 2225)", *Analecta Bollandiana* 104. Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1986: 170-177. The expression "spiritual theater(s) of the church" occurs nowhere else in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG). Hence this is a significant indication of Basilian authorship. The claims in this article about frequency of occurrence as well as the parallels adduced are based on extensive searches of the full TLG online database: <http://www.tlg.uci.edu/> (accessed April-May and October-November of 2013).

παράδοξον ἀναλήψεως θαῦμα (Marx 100, 12) // Ὡ παραδόξων θαυμάτων! (PG 52:811, 53; PG 28:1057, 13; 1100, 32; the latter is Basil's Ascension sermon); Ὡ παραδόξου θαύματος! (PG 28:1105, 12; PG 85:237, 10); cf. Καὶ ἦν ἰδεῖν θαῦμα παράδοξον (PG 85:289, 17).

The title Παράκλητος is employed in both CPG 6665 and 6666 (Marx 100, 13; PG 52:809, 62-63; 809, 72).

σήμερον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐπιδημήσας τὴν τῆς οἰκονομίας τοῦ Χριστοῦ σφραγίζει τελείωσιν (Marx 100, 13-17). Cf.: Ἐν τούτῳ πρώτῳ μετὰ τὸν Ἀβραάμ ὁ Θεὸς, τὴν κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίαν ἐφύτευσε (PG 85:193, 1); Ἐπὶ τούτοις τὸ μέγα καὶ πάνσεμνον τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν οἰκονομίας μυστήριον ἐσκευάζετο (PG 85:368, 42-43).

τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸν χορὸν ἀγιάζων [sc. Παράκλητος] (Marx 100, 15) // also in PG 52:810, 58; PG 85:249, 45; 281, 34; 288, 31; 293, 34; 296, 35; 332, 21; 344, 17; 376, 31; 389, 21; 472, 57; 28:1101, 34.

παρρησίαν δωρούμενος [sc. Παράκλητος] (Marx 100, 16) // Θεώρησον τὴν τοῦ Πέτρου δειλίαν, ἵνα μάθῃς, τίς ὁ τὴν παρρησίαν δωρούμενος (PG 28:1053, 24-26).

θαύματα χαρίζόμενος [sc. Παράκλητος] (Marx 100, 16). Cf.: Ὁ μὲν τοι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ τῆς κτίσεως Σωτὴρ, τὰς τῶν θαυμάτων δυνάμεις τοῖς μαθηταῖς χαρίσάμενος (PG 85:256, 3-6).

ῥήματι παρέχων [sc. Παράκλητος] ἀπελάνειν τὰς νόσους (Marx 100, 16-17) // λόγος ἀφιεῖτο, καὶ νόσος ἡλάνετο (PG 85:373, 23). Cf.: οὐ φέρομαι τοῖς ῥήμασι. φθέγγαι μόνον, καὶ τὸ πάθος ἐλάνεταί. Ἰδὲ σὲ μόνον ἡ νόσος θελήσαντα, καὶ τὸ νοσοῦν ὑγιάζεται (PG 85:240, 36-38); Εἰ ταχύνω τὴν παρούσαν, συστέλλω τὸ θαῦμα. εἰ παρέσομαι νόσον ἐλάνω (Cunningham 4, 19); [sc. ἡκολούθουν] οἱ νοσοῦντες τῷ τὰς νόσους ἐλάνοντι (PG 85:361, 9). And see next parallel.

καὶ σκια τῶν ἁγίων ἐξητήθη πρὸς ἱασιν. Ἐπεζήτησαν γὰρ τοῦ Πέτρου τὴν σκιά οἱ θλιβόμενοι (Marx 100, 17-19) // ὥς ἡ βίβλος διδάσκει τῶν πράξεων, καὶ Πέτρου μὲν ἡ σκιά τὰς νόσους ἀπήλυνε (PG 85:448, 34-36).

Πρὸς γὰρ τῷ θαύματι τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Πνεύματος καὶ λύσις ἀποφάσεως ἀρχαίας ἐγένετο (πρὸς with the dative to mean “in addition to”; Marx 100, 22-24) // Πρὸς τούτοις τὸ τῆς κτίσεως ἕδαφος εὐανθέσι λειμῶσιν ἐποίκιλε (PG 85:32, 44-45); Πρὸς τοίνυν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἷς Θεὸς τιμήσας τὸν ἄνθρωπον φαίνεται, καὶ λογισμῷ αὐτεξουσίου δωρεᾶς ἀμφιέσας, δέδωκε νόμον αὐτῷ, γυμνάζων τὴν αἵρεσιν (PG 85:52, 37-40); Πρὸς τούτοις, διδάξαι βούλεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ὅτι χαρὰ τοῖς δαίμοσιν ἢ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπώλεια, καὶ τρυφῶσιν ἐκεῖνοι τοῖς ἡμετέροις κακοῖς (PG 85:277, 15-18); Πρὸς τούτοις, τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κηδεμονίαν ἐδίδαξεν (PG 85:277, 23-25).

τῷ θαύματι τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ Πνεύματος (Marx 100, 23). Compare: Ἦχος οὖν βροντῆς καὶ πῦρ οὐρανόθεν καὶ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄφιν πιστομένη (PG 52:811, 28-29); Ὡ τοῦ θαύματος! Ἐξ ἀνθρωπίνης μορφῆς ἀκτῖνες ἐφέροντο θεϊκαῖς ἐνεργείαις πεμπόμεναι (PG 85:457, 7-9).

Καὶ τούτου ἡ ἀπόδειξις (Marx 100, 26) // Τίς οὖν ἐστι τούτων ἀπόδειξις, Δέσποτα; (PG 85:244, 46-47).

Ὡ τῆς ξένης ἐπιστάσεως τοῦ Πνεύματος σύντομον παρασχούσης τοῖς ἀποστόλοις σοφίαν! (Marx 100, 33-101, 2). Compare: ἡ τοὺς ἀλιέας χειροτονήσασα ῥήτορας, αὐτοσχεδίῳ σοφίᾳ τοὺς τοῦ κόσμου σοφοὺς κατασχύναςα (PG 52:809, 50-52).

The little bridge between parts two and three:

προσκύνησον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὡς ὁμοούσιον Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ (Marx 101, 11) // καὶ τῷ παναγάθῳ, καὶ ζωοποιῷ, καὶ ὁμοουσίῳ Πνεύματι (PG 85:461, 22-23).

Καὶ τὸ θαυμαστότερον, ὅτι οὐ μόνον τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ μεγαλεῖα διδάσκειν αὐτοῖς ἐχορήγησεν (Marx 101, 13-15) // Θαυμαστότερον δὲ καὶ πληγέντα μὴ προδοῦναι τῇ μάχῃ, μὴ δεῖξαι τὸν πλήξαντα χαίροντα (PG 85:216, 34-36).

Taken individually, many of these parallels are of little weight and in fact are susceptible of other explanations than Basilian authorship; taken collectively, however, they are difficult to account for apart from Basilian authorship. Moreover the first parallel cited, “spiritual theater(s) of the church,” which occurs in the two places cited and nowhere else, would appear to be decisive in favor of Basilian authorship.¹²

b. *Internal Evidence: Part Two of CPG 6665*

Part two of CPG 6665 consists only of the litany on the twelve apostles, which is the passage this sermon has in common with CPG 4537. There are several points of comparison with the rest of Basil’s corpus. The first line of that litany reads, in CPG 6665: Ὅρα γάρ μοι δώδεκα μαθητὰς ἐξ ἐνὸς διδασκάλου παιδευομένους (Marx 101, 3). Basil refers several times to Christ educating his disciples, but consistently uses ἐκπαιδεύω rather than παιδεύω, with no mention of the contrast between one and twelve. This difference might indicate that the statement in 6665 is not original

¹² This article assumes that the other sermons presently attributed to Basil (CPG 6656-6664; 49 sermons in total, not including 6665 and 6666) are largely authentic. The work of Tevel on the manuscript tradition of these sermons may be appealed to in support of this fundamental assumption.

with Basil, or it might have seemed infelicitous to use the verb ἐκπαιδύω so soon after the use of the same preposition in the phrase ἐξ ἑνός. In any case, Basil's normal usage seems clear: Οὕτω ἄρα που καὶ ὁ Δεσπότης Χριστὸς τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς πολλὰ περὶ πίστεως ἐκπαιδεύσας (PG 85:264, 41-42); Ταύτην καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐν Εὐαγγελίοις, ποικίλως τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ μαθητὰς ἐκπαιδεύει (PG 85:317, 44-45); Τοὺς γὰρ μαθητὰς ἐκπαιδεύων Χριστὸς ὅπως τοῖς τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγῶσι προσιέναι χρεὼν μετὰ προθυμίας (PG 85:356, 37-79). Cf. Τοιούτων τεχνῶν διδάσκαλος ἡ Γραφή προκαθεζεται· ταῦτα βοῶσα τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐκπαιδεύει (PG 85:184, 10-12).

A second point of comparison concerns a statement which may have a parallel in the other Pentecost sermon attributed to Basil: ὅρα μοι δώδεκα λαμπάδας ἐξ ἑνός ἀπτομένας σπινθῆρος (Marx 101, 6). Compare: Μία μὲν λαμπὰς μυρίους ἀποτεκοῦσα πυρσούς (PG 52:812, 9-10). Although it is not clear that the first statement has the Pentecost miracle in mind, both of the statements do occur in Pentecost sermons; and while the vocabulary partly differs, the idea is essentially similar.

A third point of comparison concerns this statement: ὅρα μοι δώδεκα γλώττας ἐκ μιᾶς χάριτος φθεγγόμενας (Marx 101, 10-11). Grace as a source of tongues finds parallels in the other Pentecost sermon attributed to Basil: Τὰς γλώσσας σήμερον διανείμασα χάρις (PG 52:809, 48); Νυνὶ δὲ ἡ χάρις διαιρεθεῖσας γλώττας (PG 52:811, 49-50). There is also reference in Basil's corpus to a tongue giving utterance: Οὐκ ἔστησεν αὐτοῦ βοῶσαν τὴν γλῶσσαν ὁ φόνος, οὐδὲ τὰς τοῦ αἵματος δικαιολογίας ἐνέκοψεν· ἀλλ' ἀθάνατα φθέγγεται γλῶττα κρατούμενη θανάτῳ (PG 28:1077, 32-35). So several of the elements of the statement in 6665 can be found elsewhere in Basil's writings; this state of affairs would certainly be consistent with Basilian authorship, but the vocabulary and ideas are so common that it seems unwise to place too much weight on it.

Most of the vocabulary in this brief second part of the sermon can be found elsewhere in Basil's corpus, though it is worth noting that the rather common scriptural expression "true vine" (ἀληθινῆς ἀμπέλου [John 15:1; Marx 101, 7]) is used nowhere else by him. Taken together, these points of comparison are at best inconclusive with regard to Basilian authorship. In fact the first point of comparison (παιδύω vs. ἐκπαιδύω) would seem to suggest that Basil did not compose these lines. In any case we are only dealing with eight lines of text, so it is difficult to be certain either way.

c. Internal Evidence: Part Three of CPG 6665

In the third part of CPG 6665, there are also several points of comparison with Basil's larger corpus of works. For example, the sermon describes

the blind man, who, with his sight restored, began to point out the stars and count “the daily course” τὸν δρόμον τὸν ἡμερινὸν (Marx 102, 2). This expression, which only occurs nine times in the TLG, does not occur elsewhere in Basil’s writings. The corresponding passage in CPG 4061, however, refers not to “the daily course” but rather to “the course of days” τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἡμερῶν (CPG 4061; Phrantzolas 114, 4-5), a phrase that is somewhat more common in the TLG, though the number of days in question is usually specified. Since the pronunciation of these two phrases would be very close, differing only by a syllable, it may be that CPG 4061 reflects the superior textual reading here; if that were true a parallel with the rest of Basil’s corpus could be adduced since “the course of days,” τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἡμερῶν, occurs in the other Pentecost sermon attributed to Basil (“After the course of days [τῶν ἡμερῶν ὁ δρόμος] had ascended to the number fifty ...” [PG 52:810, 61]). However, the phrase ὁ δρόμος ἡμερινὸς also occurs later in CPG 4061 (Phrantzolas 128, 4). Hence both phrases occur in CPG 4061, and one phrase occurs in CPG 6665, while the other occurs in CPG 6666. This instance of similar language seems to corroborate what is already obvious, that there is some relationship between CPG 4061 and CPG 6665.¹³ Whether the similar language constitutes a real parallel between 6665 and the rest of Basil’s corpus seems less probable.

Our sermon also describes the apostles as fishermen: “you who let down your net into the depths of the world and gathered in from every race, who caught fish that the king rejoices to dine on even until now” (οἱ τὴν σαγήνην τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης χαλάσαντες καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγόντες, οἱ θηράσαντες ἰχθύας, οὓς μέχρι καὶ νῦν δειπνῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐφραίνεται [Marx 102, 8-11]; cf. the earlier salutation: Χαίρετε ... τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγρευταί, τῶν ἐθνῶν οἱ σαγηνευταί [Marx 101, 25]).¹⁴ Basil uses similar terminology to talk about Peter and the other apostles, where Peter uses the fishhook of the faith and takes Cornelius in his fishing net; the apostles catch the people in Palestine and then expand their operation (Τοῦτον ὁ Πέτρος τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιδήσας τῆς πίστεως, δῆμον ὅλον δεσμώτην διὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γλώττης εἰργάσατο. Γίνεται καὶ Κορνήλιος ἐκεῖνος ὁ μέγας τῆς σαγήνης θήρα ταύτης. Οὕτω τοὺς κατὰ Παλαιστίνην ἀγρεύσαντες, ἔφερον ἐπὶ τὰς νήσους τὴν τέχνην τῆς χάριτος, τὴν θάλατταν μετὰ τὴν ἡπειρον σαγηνεύοντες [PG 85:337,

¹³ Although CPG 4061 and 6666 share a phrase in common (τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἡμερῶν), there do not seem to be any other parallels. Hence it would seem unlikely that there is any direct literary relationship between the two.

¹⁴ “Catchers of fish” (ἀγρευταί) and “fishermen” (σαγηνευταί, i.e. those who use the net, the σαγήνη) occur in this sermon, as mentioned above, but nowhere else in Basil’s writings. See p. 152 n. 54 for observations on the vocabulary of this block of material, and for the reading of CPG 4061, which has “speakers” (ἀγορευταί) instead of “catchers of fish” (ἀγρευταί).

17-23]). Of course it is hardly surprising to find any preacher describing the apostles as fishermen, nor are the parallels here precise, nevertheless there is certainly a confluence of vocabulary here that *could* be explained by a common author.¹⁵

The doxology of the sermon, ὃς πρέπει δόξα [κράτος] νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, finds no exact replication in the works of Basil, but its elements do: αὐτῷ γὰρ πρέπει πᾶσα δόξα (PG 28:1061, 26); νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (PG 85:452, 17; PG 28:1100, 52).

It should also be observed that there are a number of expressions and words in this third part of the sermon that do not occur elsewhere in Basil's writings. As to expressions, this part of the sermon opens with a reference to the apostles as kings, which, according to the TLG, is the only occurrence of "kings" (βασιλεῖς) and "apostles" (ἀπόστολοι) within two lines of each other in Basil's corpus. The terms above and below (ἄνω, κάτω) occur in Basil, but nowhere else are they combined with the kingdom (βασιλεία), as they are here.¹⁶ The rather common phrase "light of the world" (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου [Marx 101, 20] τοῦ κόσμου τὸ φῶς [Marx 101, 23]) does not occur elsewhere in Basil's writings. Later in this part of the sermon, reference is made to finding a treasure hidden in a field (Χαίρετε οἱ τὸν θησαυρὸν εὐρόντες τὸν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ κρυπτόμενον [Marx 102, 7]). While Basil refers several times to hidden treasure, this seems to be the only reference to anything hidden in a field, and hence the only reference to Matt 13:44.

Finally, there is also a long list of individual words that occur in this third part of the sermon, but do not occur anywhere else in Basil's writings:¹⁷ salt (ἅλας), lampstand (λυχνία), sealers (σφραγισταί: 6× in TLG, including 6665 and 4061), trainers (ἀλειτουργοί), washers (πλῦται), slayers (σφάκται), illuminators (φωτισταί: 7× in TLG, including 6665 and 4061), vigilant (ἀνύστακτοι), smiths or forgers (χαλκευταί: 12× in TLG, including 6665 and 4061), builders (τέκτονες), sail-bearing (ἄρμενοφόρους: 7× in TLG, including 6665 and 4061; the other 5× in lexicographers), money-bag (βαλάντιον), to point out with the finger (δακτυλοδεικτεῖν), silver

¹⁵ Note that even in the bridge section of this sermon, Basil describes the apostles as fishermen: "the mouths of fishermen became nets of salvation" (Ἰέγονε ... δίκτυα σωτηρίας τῶν ἀλιέων τὰ στόματτα), but there the vocabulary is different from the description in the third part (Marx 101, 16-17).

¹⁶ See p. 121 n. 7 for a similar expression of Chrysostom's.

¹⁷ The information here is based on TLG lemma searches. No form of these words could be found within the same grammatical class elsewhere in Basil's writings. E.g. if a noun is listed, no form of that noun occurs, but a cognate verb or adjective might occur. If a verb is listed, no form of that verb occurs, but the cognate noun might occur.

(ἄργυρος), belt or money belt (ζώνη),¹⁸ fellow-trampers (συμποδισταί: 5× in TLG including 6665 and 4061), overthrowers (σκαλισταί: 3× in TLG, including 6665 and 4061), purifiers (καθαίρεται), aprons (σιμικίνθια), to hew or carve stone (λαξεύω), drachma (δραχμὴν), and to dine (δειπνῶ). At least twenty-two words not used elsewhere in Basil's writings.¹⁹ Half a dozen of these words are quite rare, as noted. Their presence is just as difficult to account for in 4061 as it is in 6665. Nonetheless, in a relatively short block of text (about thirty lines) there is a relatively high proportion of terms and expressions not found elsewhere in Basil's writings. At the very least their occurrence here combined with the paucity of parallels with the rest of Basil's corpus give one pause in any attempt to attribute the original composition of this part of the sermon to Basil.

2. *The Relationship between CPG 4537 and 6665*

Having examined the evidence for Basilian authorship of CPG 6665 in its various parts, it is now appropriate to attend first to the relationship between CPG 4537 and 6665 and then to the relationship between CPG 6665 and 4061. CPG 4537 was first printed by Sir Henry Savile and subsequently taken up in the *Patrologia Graeca* (52:807-809).²⁰ J. A. de Aldama notes the disparaging remarks of Montfaucon (PG 52:803-804) but contrasts these with the rather more positive assessment found in the *Bibliotheca Graeca* of Fabricius-Harles, where the sermon is considered as of doubtful authenticity but elegant nonetheless.²¹ Marx attributes the sermon to Proclus, but his most solid piece of evidence for this attribution is the portion of text that 4537 shares with 6665, and of course the Proclan authorship of the latter has already been debunked. According to *pinakes*, CPG 4537 is extant in just five manuscripts: Basil, *Universitätsbibliothek*, A. III. 12

¹⁸ This term occurs twice in CPG 6665.

¹⁹ There are other terms in this part of the sermon that occur only rarely elsewhere in Basil's writings. For example, "lamp" (λύχνος) occurs twice, one of those times being in a scriptural citation (PG 85:196, 32; PG 28:1104, 28). Several terms that occur in this part of the sermon occur only one other time in all of Basil's writings: irresistible (ἀβίαστοι: occurs in PG 85:52, 7, where, however, it means the opposite, viz., without constraint), fringes (κράσπεδα: PG 85:376, 3, where the discussion indeed concerns the woman with the issue of blood, but no comparison is made with the miracles of the apostles as in our sermon), and cornerstone (ἀκρογωνιάου: PG 85:465, 6, the context of which is rather different from our sermon).

²⁰ Savile, Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις Πατρῶν ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου Ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν Εὐρισκομένων, 8 vols. (Eton: Ioannes Norton, 1611-12) 5:980-982.

²¹ Aldama, *Repertorium*, no. 130, with reference to Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca* 8, 481 (PG 64:1351-1352).

(112v-114; 14-15 cent.); Hagion Oros, *Monê Ibêrôn*, 0656 (Lambros 4776; item 14; 17 cent.); Oxford, *Bodleian Library*, Auct. E. 3. 16 (Misc. 051.16; p. 721-724; 1612; this is in fact Codex R, prepared at the direction of the sermon's first editor, Savile); Patras, *Monê Hagiôn Pantôn*, 02 (211v-213; 16 cent.); Turnabo, *Dêmotikê Bibliothêkê* 33 (308-310v; 323v-327; 1561-1562; homily is erased in two parts; the copyist for this manuscript and the previous is Γρηγόριος Ιερομόναχος).²² It will be of some interest to us to note that all of these manuscripts, with the exception of the first, also contain CPG 6666, the other Pentecost sermon attributed to Basil.

In order to arrive at a more precise understanding of the relationship between CPG 4537 and 6665, this section of the article undertakes a summary of the content of 4537, a comparative and contextual analysis of the litany on the twelve, which the two sermons share in common, and then an examination of the relationship between 4537 and 6666, Basil's other Pentecost sermon and the subject of the appendix.

In CPG 4537, the opening declaration of the Spirit's arrival occasions a reflection on the paradoxes of the Trinitarian economy: the Paraclete has come down but did not leave the heavens behind; God the Logos has ascended and yet is present. The Spirit was not absent before arriving; the Son is not absent after departing (PG 52:807, 35-49). Then the sermon turns to a description of the miraculous appearance of tongues of fire, which made fishermen the world's instructors, conversant in the languages of the nations present at Pentecost (807, 49-71).²³ As a contrast to Pentecost, we have the tower of Babel, where God, by a division of languages, put an end to the wicked harmony that grasped at heaven though it was unworthy of the earth. Tower construction cannot bring us up to heaven; rather it is chariots of the knowledge of God and the wings of virtue that do that (807, 71-808, 53). So, then, the sermon continues, what God took from wicked men he bestowed on the apostles, so that their teaching might be clear, since their voice was to go out into all the earth (Ps 18:5; 808, 53-809, 3). The fiery character of the tongues indicates that the tongues of the apostles would consume the devil and enlighten those sitting in darkness. Just look at the fiery tongues which are welcome to the pious but fearful to the devil! Look too at those twelve disciples, who are also generals, stars, pure rays, torches, vines, baskets, and rivers. Look too at the twelve tongues giving utterance by one grace (809, 3-22). Neither should you suppose the apostles to be drunk, for drunkenness hinders reason and speech; it is a sleepless dream, a madness that thirsts; it consumes ratioci-

²² <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/> (accessed 17 January 2014).

²³ The miracle of apostolic eloquence is an all but a ubiquitous feature of patristic and early-Byzantine Pentecost sermons.

nation and disheartens the soul (809, 22-38). It is, however, not surprising that the Jews thought the apostles were drunk since the Jews of old made the same accusation against the prophets (809, 38-810, 6).²⁴ The preacher goes on to confess that as far as he is concerned the apostles were drunk, but it was a divine drunkenness which makes one sober for virtue, desirous of God, mad like Paul, and willing to dare fire, iron, and dangers. The cup that made the apostles drunk comes from the holy table, is described by David ("your cup is intoxicating like the best" Ps 22:5), and is mixed with the Master's blood (810, 6-31). The same Master has called the fish and caught them in Peter's net; he did not catch them with persuasion, but rather with a flash of lightning like the one he used for the blessed Paul; through that same flash we behold the Master and become disciples of Christ, to whom be the glory forever and ever (810, 31-45).

This summary furnishes the broader context in which the passage in question should be situated. In general terms, and as in 6665, the passage is preceded by a discussion of the events of Pentecost and Babel. Unlike 6665, it is followed by an extended discussion of the accusation of drunkenness, and the sermon concludes with a meditation on the vocation of Peter and the call of Paul. Setting out the passages in parallel will facilitate a comparative and more precise contextual analysis.

CPG 6665 (Marx 100, 31-101, 13)

„Καὶ ὠφθησαν αὐτοῖς διαμεριζόμεναι
γλῶσσαι ὥσει πυρός.“ Ὡ τῆς ξένης
ἐπιστασίας τοῦ Πνεύματος σύντομον
παρασχούσης τοῖς ἀποστόλοις σοφίαν!

Ὅρα γάρ μοι δώδεκα μαθητάς ἐξ ἑνὸς
διδασκάλου παιδευομένους.

CPG 4537 (PG 52:809, 3-23)

Ὡφθησαν δὲ ἐν εἵδει πυρὸς μεριζόμεναι
γλῶσσαι. Καὶ γὰρ τὰ τοῦ πυρὸς ἐμελλόν
ἐνεργεῖν τῶν ἀποστόλων αἱ γλῶσσαι,
καὶ διπλῆν τὴν χρῆσιν δείκνυσθαι καὶ
τὸν μὲν διάβολον καταφλέγειν, φωτίζειν
δὲ τοὺς καθημένους ἐν σκότει.

Ὅρα μοι πῦρ παντὸς ἐλαίου τοῖς πιστοῖς
προσηνέστερον.

Ὅρα μοι γλῶτταν παντὸς πυρὸς τῷ
διαβόλῳ φοβρωτέραν.

Ὅρα μοι γλῶτταν τῆς ἀσεβείας τὰς
ἀκάνθας συμφλέγουσαν, καὶ τὰ λήϊα
τῆς εὐσεβείας δροσίζουσιν.

Ὅρα μοι δώδεκα μαθητάς ἐξ ἑνὸς
διδασκάλου παιδευομένους.

²⁴ Anti-Jewish polemic, usually occasioned by the accusation of apostolic drunkenness recorded in Acts 2:13, is a prominent feature in several patristic and early Byzantine Pentecost sermons. It also occurs, for example, in CPG 3191 (Gregory of Nyssa), 4343.1 (Chrysostom), 4536 (Pseudo-Chrysostom), 5815 (Proclus), and 6666 (Basil of Seleucia).

CPG 6665 (Marx 100, 31-101, 13)

ὄρα μοι δώδεκα φωστῆρας λαμπροὺς ἐκ
 μιᾶς ἀνατέλλοντας κορυφῆς·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα καθαράς ἀκτῖνας ἐξ ἑνὸς
 προϊούσας ἡλίου·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα λαμπάδας ἐξ ἑνὸς
 ἀπτομένους σπινθῆρος·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα κλήματα ἐξ ἀληθινῆς
 ἀμπέλου βλαστήσαντα·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα κοφίνους ἐκ μιᾶς
 πληρουμένους τραπέζης·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα ποταμοὺς ἐκ μιᾶς
 προφερομένους πηγῆς·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα γλώττας ἐκ μιᾶς
 χάριτος φθεγγομένας,

καὶ προσκύνησον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον
 ὡς ὁμοούσιον Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ· οὐδὲ γὰρ
 ἐκ μελέτης καὶ μαθήσεως λόγων σοφοῦς
 τοὺς
 ἀμαθεῖς εἰργάσατο τὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' ἐξ
 αὐτῆς τῶν γλωσσῶν ἀναπλάσεως.

CPG 4537 (PG 52:809, 3-23)

ὄρα μοι δώδεκα στρατηγούς ὅφ' ἐνὶ
 βασιλεῖ ταπτομένους·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα φωστῆρας λαμπροὺς ἐκ
 μιᾶς ἀνατέλλοντας κορυφῆς·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα καθαράς ἀκτῖνας ἐξ ἑνὸς
 προϊούσας ἡλίου·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα λαμπάδας ἐξ ἑνὸς
 ἀπτομένους σπινθῆρος·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα κλήματα ἐξ ἀληθινῆς²⁵
 ἀμπέλου βλαστήσαντα·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα κοφίνους ἐκ μιᾶς
 πληρουμένους τραπέζης·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα ποταμοὺς ἐκ μιᾶς
 προφερομένους πηγῆς·
 ὄρα μοι δώδεκα γλώττας ἐκ μιᾶς
 χάριτος φθεγγομένας.

Καὶ μὴ νομίσης αὐτοὺς μεθύειν ...

Taking the passage from CPG 6665 first, we note that it is framed on either side with a reference to the miraculous, Spirit-taught wisdom that the apostles acquired at Pentecost. The litany itself consists of eight lines, all beginning with the same three words, ὄρα μοι δώδεκα. Given the frame of the litany, one might expect each line to describe some aspect of the Spirit's relationship to the twelve, but the first line, "For behold twelve disciples educated by one teacher!" naturally suggests the relationship between the apostles and Christ, rather than the apostles and the Spirit (Marx 101, 3). The same is true of the fifth line, "Behold twelve branches growing from the true vine!" (Marx 101, 7), which alludes to Christ's words to his disciples in John 15:1, 5 ("I am the true vine ... you are the branches"). Many of the other lines in the litany could be read as referring either to Christ or to the Spirit, though by the time we come to the last line, "Behold twelve tongues giving utterance by one grace," it seems clear that the Holy Spirit is the divine agent most in view, for the preacher immediately goes on to exhort his hearers to "worship the Holy Spirit as consubstantial with the Father and the Son" (Marx 101, 10-11). In addition to

²⁵ In place of ἀληθινῆς here, the PG text actually reads ἑνὸς ἀπτομένους. These two words have obviously been transposed from the line above; Marx's text offers us the correct reading.

this indeterminacy between Christ and the Spirit, there is perhaps a discordant note struck between the first line of the litany, “behold twelve disciples (μαθητὰς) educated by one teacher!” and the concluding statement that “the Spirit did not make the unlearned (ἄμαθεῖς) wise by study and instruction (μαθήσεως) in words” (Marx 101, 11-13), which seems to disparage the discipleship praised in the first line. The latter denial, however, may simply constitute a further delineation of the discipleship mentioned in the first line of the litany. Perhaps, too, we should not expect a strict discrimination in the litany between the work of Christ and of the Spirit since Christ, after all, gives the Spirit, and the Spirit is, as the preacher says, consubstantial with the Father and the Son. Generally speaking, the litany fits well in its immediate context.

The litany’s emphasis on the twelve, moreover, also fits well within the larger context of CPG 6665, which exhibits a sustained interest in the twelve apostles as a unit. Early on in the sermon, the Paraclete is said to sanctify “the choir of the apostles” (Marx 100, 15). It is also the apostles as a group who are furnished with a sudden wisdom (Marx 101, 1-2) and whom the Spirit made wise by the reformation of tongues, so that they might “teach the mighty works of God” (Marx 101, 13-15). Additionally a reference to the “mouths of fishermen” which became “nets of salvation” (Marx 101, 16-17) introduces the final section of the sermon, which consists of a series of salutations to the apostles as a group, lauding their status, miracles, and ministry (Marx 101, 17-102, 14). Based solely on this analysis of the eight-line litany on the twelve in its literary context, it seems quite possible that the author of the sermon composed those lines himself; if they were imported from elsewhere, they have been carefully and rather successfully integrated into the sermon.

If we turn our attention to the litany’s literary context in CPG 4537, we see that there too the apostles as a group constitute a theme of some importance. The sermon refers to them as “sons of thunder” (τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς βροντῆς [PG 52:807, 522-53], arguably referring to the whole group), “fishermen” (ἁλιεῖς [807, 60]), “educators of the world” (twice: οἱ τῆς οἰκουμένης παιδευταί [807, 62-63; 808, 61]), “saints” (τοὺς ἁγίους [808, 57]), “servants of the word” (οἱ τοῦ λόγου διάκονοι [808, 58]) whose voice has gone out into all the world (Ps 18:5; 808, 69-70), and “disciples of the Savior” (οἱ τοῦ Σωτῆρος μαθηταί [810, 19-20]). Together the apostles received what was taken from wicked men at the tower of Babel (808, 54-56), and they were collectively accused of drunkenness at the day of Pentecost (809, 22-23). So in both sermons, the litany fits well with each sermon’s general themes.

The formal aspects of the litany are somewhat different in the two sermons. To begin with, while in CPG 6665 the litany consists of eight

lines, in CPG 4537 it has twelve. In 4537 nine of those lines begin, as in CPG 6665, with the three words ὅρα μοι δώδεκα, and concern the twelve apostles; in 4537, however, the first three lines of the litany concern the fiery tongues the apostles received, and begin Ὅρα μοι πῦρ, and ὅρα μοι γλώτταν (twice). In contrast to CPG 6665, the litany in 4537 has an introduction, but no concluding statement to form a frame; instead after the last line of the litany, the sermon moves rather abruptly to the discussion of drunkenness.

The introduction to the litany in CPG 4537 is concerned with the fiery tongues of the apostles, and in particular with what their fiery aspect signifies. The twofold purpose of the fiery tongues, we are told, was “to consume the devil and to enlighten those sitting in darkness” (809, 7; Luke 1:79). The first three lines of the litany more or less elaborate this twofold purpose: the fiery tongues have a dual, Janus-like aspect that is fearful to the devil and “consumes the thorns of impiety,” but that is soothing (“smoother than any oil”) to the faithful and “bedews the standing crops of piety” (809, 8-12). The nine lines about the twelve apostles, however, do not really describe the effects of the fiery tongues on either the devil or the faithful; rather, as in CPG 6665, they describe the apostles and their relationship to Christ or the Spirit or both.

This comparative analysis of the litany on the twelve in CPG 6665 and 4537, then, shows that while both sermons take up the theme of the twelve and hence can offer a home to the litany, the litany as preserved in CPG 6665 seems to fit its immediate context better than the litany as preserved in CPG 4537. The introduction to the litany in CPG 4537 does not adequately prepare for its contents and the transition to drunkenness, while not illogical (the source supplying the apostles was Christ and the Spirit, not drunkenness), is nevertheless certainly abrupt. Moreover it would seem easier to understand why an author would take an eight-membered litany on the apostles and turn it into a twelve-membered litany than it is to understand why an author would take the twelve-membered litany on the apostles and reduce it to eight. If the offending lines of CPG 4537 were deemed unsuitable by the author of 6665, why not replace or rework them rather than sacrifice the symbolism of the twelve? These considerations are not decisive in themselves, but it does seem unlikely that the author of CPG 6665 copied from CPG 4537, while the reverse is not implausible at all.

3. The Relationship between CPG 4537 and 6666

Although both CPG 6665 and 4537 discuss the tower of Babel, and exhibit a general congruence of topic, besides the litany on the twelve there do not seem to be any other points of contact between CPG 4537 and 6665.

CPG 6666 also contains a discussion of Babel and of course has the themes one would expect in a Pentecost sermon, but beyond that the sermon also has two specific and unmistakable points of contact with CPG 4537.

In the opening lines of CPG 6666 we read that “the one who predicted the arrival (τὴν ἄφιξιν) is not false” (807, 38). From the context it is clear that the arrival of the Spirit is meant. A little later in the sermon we read this description of the Pentecostal miracle: “and all of a sudden a loud voice was heard, and a sound of a violent breeze was produced, and the Spirit’s arrival imitated a clap of thunder” (καὶ φωνῆς μέγεθος ἐξαίφνης ἤκούετο, καὶ βιαίας αὐραὶ ἤχος ἀπετελεῖτο, καὶ βροντῆς τύπον ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄφιξις ἐμιμεῖτο (PG 52:807, 50-52). With this description should be compared the description of the same event from CPG 4537: “So there was a sound of thunder and heaven-sent fire, and the Spirit’s activity confirmed the Spirit’s arrival” (Ἦχος οὖν βροντῆς καὶ πῦρ οὐρανόθεν καὶ ἐνέργεια τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄφιξιν πιστουμένη [PG 52:811, 28-29]). Probably we should construe τοῦ Πνεύματος with ἐνέργεια, but the proximity of the three nouns justifies the double translation given here. In any case, the phrase “arrival of the Spirit” has already occurred in CPG 4537, and hence would be in the reader’s or hearers’ mind.²⁶ That phrase is itself comparatively rare; apart from the occurrences noted here, it is attested only four other times in the TLG.²⁷ Moreover βροντή and ἄφιξις occur in close proximity to each other only in these two sermons in the entire TLG. Given that there is certainly a literary relationship between 4537 and one Basilian Pentecost sermon (i.e., CPG 6665), the most likely explanation for the confluence of terms and themes we see here is that there is a literary relationship between 4537 and both Basilian Pentecost sermons.

The second point of contact between CPG 4537 and 6666 concerns the expression “educators of the world,” which occurs twice in CPG 4537: Οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐνός τινος ἦσαν ἔθνους διδάσκαλοι, οἱ δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης γεγέννηνται παιδευταί (52:807, 62-63). “Εδδει γὰρ τοὺς τῆς οἰκουμένης

²⁶ “Εδδει γὰρ τοὺς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀποδεξαμένους ὑποδέξασθαι καὶ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἄφιξιν (PG 52:809, 65-66).

²⁷ ἐξοικίζεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θείου πνεύματος ἄφιξιν (Philo, *Quis rerum divinarum heres sit?* [265,3] in P. Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, vol. 3. [Berlin: Reimer, 1898; repr. De Gruyter, 1962]: 1-71); αἰσθόμενος [sc. ὁ Προφήτης] τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἀφίξεως (Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentaria in Psalmos* PG 23:580, 40-41); Ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ φωνῆς . . . πῶς τὴν ἄφιξιν κατοπτέουσιν τοῦ Πνεύματος (Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In conceptionem venerabilis praecursoris* [homilia 16] 17.5 in M. Aubineau, *Les homélies festales d’Hésychius de Jérusalem*, vol. 2. *Les homélies xvi-xxi* [Subsidia hagiographica 59; Brussels: Société des Bollandistes, 1980]: 668-704); ἐξ οὐρανῶν ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἄφιξιν, θάρσους ἀπείρου ποιητικῆν (Nicephorus Blemmydes, *Laudatio Sancti Ioanni Evangelistae* [18.11] in J.A. Munitiz, “Blemmydes’ Encomium on Christ’s holy apostle and evangelist, John the theologian,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 107 [1989]: 302-344).

παιδευτὰς τὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐπίστασθαι (52:808, 61-63). This expression is preserved in only three other places in the TLG: twice in Basil of Seleucia, and once in the Acts of Ephesus. One of the occurrences in Basil of Seleucia is in fact CPG 6666, where we read, Πρὸς δὲ γλώσσας μεριζομένη τορνεύεται, ἵνα διδασκάλους τοὺς ὑποδεχομένους ἐργάσῃται, ἵν' ἐν πυρὶ πορευόμενοι παιδευτὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπάρξωσι (52:811, 39-41).²⁸ Given what has already been established regarding these two sermons, it seems difficult to conclude anything else than that one of these authors has borrowed this phrase from the other. It is practically certain, then, that there is a literary relationship between 4537 and 6666; which direction that relationship ran is probably not determinable on the basis of looking solely at 4537 and 6666. There are, however, several other issues to be addressed before we draw conclusions about the relationship between 4537 and 6665.

First, is it possible that CPG 4537 is also a sermon of Basil of Seleucia? Although there do not seem to be any links between CPG 6665 and 4537 apart from the litany on the twelve apostles and the fact that both sermons address Babel, there may be several additional parallels between CPG 6666 and 4537, though none as striking as those adduced above. Be that as it may, there are several reasons to resist attributing CPG 4537 to Basil. To begin with, there are a couple of notable expressions present in CPG 4537 which do not occur in Basil's writings. The verb *μυσταγωγεῖν* (PG 52:808, 66), which is quite common in Chrysostom, for example, does not occur in Basil's writings. Of the apostles we also read in CPG 4537 that "they were filled with the holy table" (τῆς ἁγίας τραπέζης ἐνεφορήθησαν PG 52:810, 12). Ἁγία τραπέζα is an increasingly common expression from the fourth century on, but it does not occur in the writings of Basil.²⁹ Perhaps the most notable such expression is found in the simple declaration, Ἀλλ' ἀνῆλθεν ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος (PG 52:807, 45); the exceedingly common phrase ὡς ἄνθρωπος does not seem to occur in Basil's sermons in the normal christological sense.³⁰ This curious absence suggests that the

²⁸ The other Basilian occurrence is in CPG 6659, *Homilia in assumptionem domini*: Τούτων ὑπομιμνήσκων Ἰουδαίοις ὁ Παῦλος ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης παιδευτῆς (PG 28:1097.51-53). The remaining occurrence can be found in a sermon of Paul of Emesa, delivered in Alexandria. As transmitted in the Acts of Ephesus, it is not Paul's own phrase, but rather a popular acclamation addressed to him: ἐπίσκοπε ὀρθόδοξε, τῆς οἰκουμένης παιδευτὰ (*Concilium universale Ephesenum anno 431* [ed. E. Schwartz, *Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum*; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1928] 1.1.4, p. 12, ln. 3).

²⁹ Describing the grace poured out on the apostles at Pentecost, the anonymous preacher of CPG 4537 says, οἱ τοῦ λόγου διάκονοι τὰς τοῦ λόγου μορφὰς ὑποδέχονται (PG 52:808, 59-60; cf. Acts 6:4). The expression οἱ τοῦ λόγου διάκονοι is also lacking in Basil's writings, though it occurs less than ten times elsewhere, according to the TLG.

³⁰ The one time the two words do occur together, they do not have in view the idea that Christ has said or done something as a man, which is the common use for the expression: Ὡς

author of CPG 4537 exhibits a different Christology than Basil. Beyond these curious absences, however, is the simple fact that while there are indisputable points of contact between CPG 4537 and both 6665 and 6666, there do not seem to be any parallels between CPG 4537 and the rest of Basil's writings. If Basil had written CPG 4537 we could expect to find points of contact with many more Basilian sermons than just these two. It seems unlikely, then, both that Basil wrote CPG 4537 and that the author of CPG 4537 was familiar with Basil's larger corpus.

A second issue of interest to us here is the possibility that CPG 4537 exhibits familiarity with CPG 5815, the Pentecost sermon attributed to Proclus of Constantinople. The two sermons touch on several of the same topics and share some general vocabulary, but these facts indicate nothing more than that the two sermons are part of the homiletical tradition on Pentecost. More specific points of contact, however, can be found with the opening sentence of CPG 5815: Σήμερον, ἀγαπητοί, ἐπεφοίτησε τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡ χάρις, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας· ἀύξανομένη δὲ μέχρι τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας μεγαλύνεται (PG 65:805, 20-23). With this should be compared the incipit of CPG 4537: Ἐπεφοίτησεν ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις· ἀληθὴς γὰρ ὁ τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑποσχόμενος (PG 52:807, 35-36). Although it is striking to have parallel incipits for sermons devoted to the same feast day, the vocabulary deployed here is rather common in discussions of Pentecost.³¹ Hence if that were the only point of contact between the two sermons, it could probably be dismissed as a coincidence, but the second part of the opening sentence of CPG 5815, ἐπεφοίτησε τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἡ χάρις, ἀρξαμένη μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς

γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, οὕτω φέρω πρὸς τὸν ἐμαυτοῦ Πατέρα τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἐφάμιλλον (PG 85:297, 12-14). Basil is here drawing a comparison between human and divine generation, not employing the hermeneutical device of differential ascription.

³¹ ἐπειδήπερ ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος χάρις καὶ διανομὴ οὕτω ἐπεφοίτησε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (Gregory of Nyssa, *Epistulae* 2.18,7-8, in G. Pasquali, *Gregorii Nysseni opera*, vol. 8.2, 2nd ed. [Leiden: Brill, 1959] 3-95); εὐθέως καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐφίσταται μετὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπιφοιτᾷ χάρις (Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Romanos*, PG 60:464, 33-34); Τηνικαῦτα γὰρ ἐπεφοίτησεν ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις, οἷόν τινος δρόσου ψεκᾶδας μιμουμένη, τοῖς ἀποστόλοις (Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80:1380, 38-40); κατὰ τὴν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς ἡμέραν, ἐν ᾗ τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ἐπεφοίτησεν ἡ χάρις (Theodoret, *ibid.*, PG 80:1397, 5-7); ἡνίκα τῶν ἱερῶν συνειλεγμένων ἀποστόλων ἐπεφοίτησεν ἡ χάρις τοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἐλάλουν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις (Theodoret, *Commentaria in Isaiam*, 13, 295, in J.-N. Guinot, *Théodore de Cyr. Commentaire sur Isaïe*, vols. 1-3 [*Sources chrétiennes* 276, 295, 315; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980, 1982, 1984]: 1:136-330; 2:12-478; 3:12-350; καὶ οἶνει πυρίνη γλώσση καλὸν τι καὶ ᾠδικὸν τερετίζοντος, ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος χάρις ἐπιφοιτήσασα πάντας εἰς δοξολογίαν ἐκίνει Θεοῦ (Ps. John of Damascus, *Vita Barlaam et Joasaph*, 534, 2-4, in H. Mattingly and G.R. Woodward, [*St. John Damascene*] *Barlaam and Joasaph* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914; repr. 1983] 2-610).

σήμερον ἡμέρας, finds a possible parallel later in CPG 4537: Ἐντεῦθεν ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡρξάτο χάρις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ περὶ τῶν φθόγγων πρότερον ἐθαυματούργησεν (PG 52:808, 68-70).³² Here, in both places, we have a statement that the grace of the Spirit began from a certain point. In 5815 that point is ἀπὸ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας while in 4537 it is ἐντεῦθεν, which of course are different expressions, but the idea they express is quite similar. The cognate incipits of these two sermons, supported by the additional parallel make it plausible to suppose that one of these authors was familiar with the other sermon. Which way such a dependency may have run is less clear, but one might tentatively suggest that it would seem more likely for the author of 4537 to have been familiar with at least the incipit of 5815, and to reflect that familiarity both in the incipit of 4537 and at a later point in the sermon, than for the author of 5815 to have recalled bits and pieces of 4537 and then put them together to compose an incipit for 5815. If 4537 depends on the Pentecost sermon attributed to Proclus (5815), it would lend credence to the idea that before composing 4537 its author consulted multiple Pentecost sermons.

We are now in a position to synthesize the results of the investigation of CPG 4537 thus far. Our original question was whether CPG 6665 depends on 4537 or vice versa. First we should note the rather late and limited attestation of 4537, and that in a sermon attributed by the manuscript tradition to Chrysostom. This scarce and late attestation is not of itself a demonstration of date, but it does indicate that 4537 never achieved the liturgical currency of either CPG 6665 or 6666 and probably suggests a relatively late date. Comparative literary analysis of the litany on the twelve in both 6665 and 4537 suggests that it is more at home in 6665 than in 4537. Finally we have an assuredly literary relationship between 4537 on the one hand and both 6665 and 6666 on the other, as well as a probable relationship between 4537 and 5815, the Pentecost sermon attributed to Proclus of Constantinople. It might be that Basil of Seleucia was familiar with CPG 4537, and this familiarity was reflected in both of his Pentecost sermons. Or it might be that before composing 4537 its author consulted multiple Pentecost sermons. Those sermons would certainly have included 6665 and 6666 and probably 5815 as well. Perhaps it is easier to imagine the author of 4537 consulting and borrowing from several Pentecost sermons than it is to imagine Basil consulting and borrowing from 4537

³² The context of this latter remark is the claim that the apostles were about to bring their message to the entire world, but if they were not understood, then no one would believe. The miracle of languages at Pentecost meets that need, and a citation of Psalm 18:5, cited at Rom 10:18, confirms the reasoning: “Their voice (ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν) has gone out into all the earth.”

on two different occasions. It would seem, then, that several lines of analysis converge to suggest that CPG 4537 is dependent on CPG 6665 of Basil of Seleucia and not vice versa. If there were no relationship between 4537 and 6666, we might hypothesize a third source on which 4537 could have depended instead of on 6665 (perhaps accounting for the differences between the two litanies), but the acknowledged relationship between 4537 and 6666 makes that hypothesis very unlikely.

4. *The Relationship between CPG 4061 and 6665*

CPG 4061 is the other sermon with which 6665 shares in common a block of material. As noted at the outset of this article, CPG 4061 was originally published by Joseph Assemani, who used the only manuscript then known, *Coisl.* 296 (207-213v*, 12th cent.) of the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* in Paris. *Pinakes* now reports another, namely, *ms.* 132 (p. 268-290*) of the *Monê tês Olumpiotissês* in Ellassona, which is dated to the seventeenth century.³³

The peculiarity of this sermon, especially in its treatment of just six figures, whom it styles apostles, may account for the sermon's limited circulation. This peculiarity will become evident through a review of its contents. Following that review, and in order to ascertain, to the extent possible, the relationship between this sermon and CPG 6665, we will then examine potential clues as to date or authorship before finally turning to a comparative literary analysis of the block of material the two sermons share in common.

The first section of this sermon (Phrantzolas 112, 1-115, 7), which it shares in common with CPG 6665, is identifiable as a unit both by its anaphoric literary form as well as by its content. Formally, we have a series of ten salutations to the apostles as a group, with each salutation beginning with the word *Χαίρετε*. As to content, the apostles are said to be kings of Christ who rule the kingdom above and the kingdom below; they are the salt of the earth and the light of the world which illumines the benighted and cleanses the hidden things. The apostles educate teachers and train the just; they are the smiths of the preacher's voice, trainers of his boldness, and builders of his words. Although they had no knapsack, they filled the world with wealth. The sea supported them walking upon it, just as it does with boats. They had no money, but bestowed many things on the lame and healed the blind. The apostles are trampleers of the devil, who chisel the deceitfulness out of our souls; their very shadows bring the dead to life.

³³ <http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/> (accessed: 17 January 2014).

The apostles are the ones who found the treasure hidden in the field; as fishers of men they have gathered in from every race. They founded heavenly churches on the cornerstone.

The second, brief section (Phrantzolas 115, 8-116, 3) offers an apology for discussing six figures (Paul, Peter, Andrew, Thomas, Luke, and John) and not also the rest of the apostles. Biblical precedent for the number six is adduced. No apology is made for including Paul, Luke, and John — by whom the preacher means John the Baptist, as will become evident later in the sermon — among the number of the twelve.

In the third section (Phrantzolas 116, 4-13), Peter is the first to be saluted (ἀσπάζασθαι [Phrantzolas 116, 5]), with the words Χαίροις ἡμῖν, ὦ Πέτρε, and it is this salutation, adapted and repeated several times for each figure, which structures the sermon's treatment of Peter, Paul, Luke, Andrew, and John the Baptist. This order is the actual order followed in the sermon rather than that given in the list of the second section.³⁴ Peter is lauded as the door of the apostles, the tongue of the disciples, and the first-born keeper of the keys. Though he fell, he thereafter snatched the crown from the adversary's head.

Paul is the next to be praised (Phrantzolas 117, 1-12). He won over rulers, persuaded rhetors and sophists to listen to the uneducated, and was taken up into paradise. His epistles are like laws; he set the world aright with ink.

Luke (Phrantzolas 117, 13-118, 12) gathered the chosen flowers of Paradise; all the churches praise him, who neither passed by the first things, nor overlooked the second, but rather composed a double book to describe them both. He adorned the Virgin full of grace, disclosed the leapings of Elizabeth, and was not silent about the circumcision, in order to show that he who became flesh took on along with it our suffering.

Andrew (Phrantzolas 119, 1-12) was the first of the first and the first to drink from the spring of life. He let out his net in exchange for grace; he brought his brother Simon, like some kind of fish, to Christ. He recognized the sun through the lamp; he heard the lamb, and contemplated God.

John the Baptist (Phrantzolas 120, 1-121, 3) is the exodus of the old and the entrance of the new; he saw the invisible dove, whose feet were unbound, whose wing was free, and whom no sword could touch. John is saluted once again (Χαίροις ἡμῖν, Ἰωάννη) and at this point there is a

³⁴ The section devoted to Thomas departs from the literary form marked by the salutation Χαίροις ἡμῖν.

lacuna in the text.³⁵ When the text continues, the discussion concerns the soldier who stabbed Jesus with a spear. That spear was blessed to Jesus, the one who was stabbed, for by it he, like a good shepherd, gave drink to his flock from his own side, but the spear became fearful to the one who stabbed; he opened the spring, but did not himself receive a drink.

This account of the soldier sets up a contrast with Thomas, to whom the preacher now devotes almost as much space (58 lines) as he has to the individual praise of the five preceding figures (60 lines). The preacher undertakes a rehabilitation of Thomas by means of an exegesis of Ps 76:2-4: "With my voice I cried to the Lord, with my voice to my God, and he paid attention to me. In a day of my affliction I sought God, with my hands, at night, before him, and I was not deceived; my soul refused to be comforted. I remembered God, and I was glad." These words are placed on the lips of Thomas; they describe the existential crisis that he went through in the interval between the crucifixion and the post-resurrection appearance at which he finally saw and touched the risen Christ (John 20:19-29). The miracles Jesus did while alive had indeed been astounding, but Thomas at first refused to believe that one who had been stabbed was the Redeemer or that one who had suffered in the flesh was to be called God. He was moreover perplexed by the testimony of the soldiers, who said, at the instigation of the Pharisees, "His disciples came by night and stole him away while we were asleep" (Matt 28:13). Hence the diligent yearning and seeking on Thomas's part recorded in the psalm. Thomas's search was not in vain. He saw the wounds and there was no corruption; he put his fingers on the life-giving stripes; he remembered that God had become incarnate and so he made the double confession, "My Lord and my God," which Christ did not refuse, as the psalm says, "he paid attention to me" (John 20:28; Ps 76:2).

In the sermon's penultimate section (Phrantzolas 125, 9-128, 9), we are treated to another anaphoric refrain. Thomas made his declaration "because he wanted to bring theology up to the one (εἰς ἐκεῖνον τὴν θεολογίαν ἀναγαγεῖν βουλόμενος) concerning whom Moses said, 'This is the Lord your God; He is God of gods and Lord of lords'" (Deut 10:17). This statement is the first in a series of twelve, each beginning in the same way and introducing a scriptural quotation, most (though not all) of which

³⁵ On the possible significance of this lacuna, see Michel Aubineau, *Les homélies festales*, 2:229-231, who demurs from the suggestion of Hemmerdinger-Iliadou (see n. 38 below) that this lacuna marks a kind of seam, with the material on either side coming from different sources. He notes that Thomas is mentioned already at the beginning of the sermon. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, it is noteworthy that the structuring device *Χαίροις ἡμῖν* does not reappear after the lacuna.

come from the minor prophets, known in the Septuagint as the Book of the Twelve. The sermon quotes Moses, Hosea, Amos, Joel, Jonah, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Malachi, Haggai, Zechariah, and Isaiah, in that order.³⁶ Each quotation features a reference to God (Θεός) and Lord (Κύριος); hence the confession of Thomas is seen to fulfill each prophetic utterance.

In the concluding section (Phrantzolas 128, 10-130, 10), the preacher takes up the theme of Christ's second coming and the ensuing judgment against those who blaspheme. The witness of the apostles has gone out into the whole world, but no one can receive a crown without going through tribulation. The preacher acknowledges that this is not an era of persecutions, but Christians must still fast while others live in luxury, and they even listen to this rhetor with an increase of love and devotion.

The Byzantine homiletical tradition contains sermons devoted to Peter and Paul as well as sermons devoted to the other individual figures treated in this sermon. Nevertheless, CPG 4061 seems to be unique in focusing on these six. As we have already observed, only three of the six are included among the classical lists of the twelve; hence the sermon would seem to employ both a broad and narrow definition of the term "apostle." Although the anaphora of prophetic quotations at the end of the sermon does not overtly refer to the apostles, it is a twelve-membered list and may thus be said to form an *inclusio* with the block of material at the beginning of the sermon (Phrantzolas 112, 1-115, 7), which praises the apostles as a group, though not explicitly as a group of twelve. That block of material, then, though its collective focus differs from most of the rest of the sermon, is not thematically out of keeping with it. It is easy to imagine the author of

³⁶ Note that Micah and Nahum are left out of this list, apparently in favor of Moses and Isaiah. That Moses was a prophet is a scriptural idea (Deut 18:5; cited in Acts 3:22; 7:37). If one takes into account that Micah and Nahum have been left out, then the order of the twelve here departs from the standard LXX order (e.g., in Rahlfs) in two respects: Jonah and Obadiah have been reversed and Malachi precedes Haggai. For more on the order of the twelve, see Barry Allen Jones, *The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon*, (SBL Dissertation Series 149; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995); Marvin A. Sweeney, "Sequence and Interpretation in the Book of the Twelve" in *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (eds. James D. Nogalski and Marvin A. Sweeney; SBL Symposium Series 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 49-74, esp. 52 n. 7, which has five different ancient orders. Most useful, however, on the question of the order of the twelve in the LXX is still Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge, 1900) who gives a catalogue of orders from ancient lists and manuscripts (201-214). The reversal of Jonah and Obadiah is attested in, for example, Gregory of Nazianzus (Swete, 205, no. 6), the list from Codd. Barocc. (Swete, 209, no. 19), and in Codex Claromontanus (Swete, 213, no. 9). Jones, 54, notes that in 4QXII^a Jonah follows Malachi, but in all the other instances reported in Swete, Jones, and Sweeney, Malachi comes last in the order of the twelve.

the sermon taking the initial block of material over from another source and adapting it to his purposes, but a survey of the sermon's content does not require us to adopt that hypothesis.

Nevertheless, this overview of the sermon's content does raise several questions. First, is the attribution to Ephrem indicative of any Syriac source material for the sermon? Next, does the sermon contain any additional clues as to its date or authorship? Finally, does a comparison of CPG 6665 and 4061 give any indication as to priority?

Before addressing these questions it will be useful to start towards the end of the sermon with one tantalizing reference to the political circumstances of its composition. After exhorting his audience with the words of Paul and Barnabas, "through many tribulations we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22), the preacher addresses a potential objection:

You will probably say, "This is not a season of danger; the emperors are not engaging in persecution. Quite to the contrary, they crown the Church, they honor the priests, they encourage the people, and they run to the fishermen. The magistrates guard the theater of the Spirit; the people are with us, the faithful, and they pray to share in our blessings."

"Where, then, is the tribulation?" you ask.³⁷

In the first place, the relative political and religious stability implied by these remarks would seem to be inconsistent with the general outline of Ephrem the Syrian's life, if there were ever any serious question of tracing the sermon back to him. One would like to deduce something further from the passage cited, but it would seem to fit well enough with any city in the Greek-speaking world after the fourth century. The attention given to imperial piety and support of the church suggests but does not require a Constantinopolitan provenance.

Several Syriac hymns have been put forward as possible source material for portions of this sermon. The hymns in question were published by Thomas Josephus Lamy and suggested as possible sources for this sermon in the article on *Éphrem Grec* by D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou in the

³⁷ Σὺ δὲ πάντως ἐρεῖς· οὐκ ἔστι κινδύνων ὁ καιρός· οὐ διώκουσιν οἱ βασιλεῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον στεφανοῦσι τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν, δοξάζουσι τοὺς ἱερεῖς, ἀλείφουσι τὸν λαὸν καὶ τοῖς ἀλειτουργοῖς τρέχουσι· δορυφοροῦσιν οἱ ἄρχοντες τὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος θέατρον· οἱ δὲ ἡμεῖς μεθ' ἡμῶν τῶν πιστῶν εἰσι, καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν μετασχεῖν τῶν ἡμετέρων εὐχονται. Τίς τοίνυν ἢ θλιψίς, ἐπερωτᾷς (Phrantzolas, 129, 14-130, 4). For the meaning of the plural *δῆμοι*, see Alan Cameron, *Circus Factions: Blues and Greens at Rome and Constantinople* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 29-39. Since the context makes no allusion to the circus, we should not see here a reference to circus partisans.

Dictionnaire de Spiritualité.³⁸ Hymns III and IV deal with Peter and Paul respectively, while hymns V-VIII are devoted to the apostle Thomas. No Syriac material has been suggested as a possible source for the treatment of Andrew, Luke, or John the Baptist found in CPG 4061. Hymns III and IV, however, have surprisingly little in common with the relevant sections in our sermon.³⁹ Of hymns V-VIII, VI-VIII deal with the works of Thomas in the East, a theme not even hinted at in CPG 4061. Hymn V deals with the biblical material on Thomas, and there we might hope to find more material for comparison. There is indeed some similarity in that both hymn V and CPG 4061 generally excuse Thomas from the charge of disbelief, but apart from similarities that can be accounted for as arising from the same NT scriptural texts, the two do not seem to have much else in common. There do not appear to be any close parallels, and Ps 76, which is the focus of discussion in CPG 4061, is entirely missing in hymn V. There is no persuasive reason to suppose that the author of 4061 had read or made use of this handful of Syriac hymns.

Does the sermon contain any other clues as to authorship or date? Hemmerdinger-Iliadou has in fact also posited some affinity between CPG 4061 and a sermon of Hesychius of Jerusalem, *In S. Andream*. The editor of Hesychius's festal sermons, Michel Aubineau, has examined the possible similarities and concluded that most of them may be explained by a similarity of theme and the underlying scriptural sources.⁴⁰ Aubineau did, however, identify one sentence from CPG 4061 that finds a close parallel in Hesychius. After praising Andrew for being the first of the disciples, and for leaving his fishing net behind in exchange for the grace of the Spirit, the anonymous preacher of CPG 4061 also praises Andrew's response to the pronouncement of the forerunner: ὁ ἀκούσας ἀμνόν, καὶ νοήσας Θεόν (Phrantzolas 119, 10-11). Similarly Hesychius cites John's pronouncement, "Ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (John 1:29), and immediately describes Andrew's response: Σὺ δὲ ἀμνὸν ἀκούσας εὐαγγελίζει Θεόν (Aubineau 2, 21). Despite the variations in word order and vocabulary, the similarity of these two formulas seems to suggest a rela-

³⁸ Lamy, *Sancti Ephraem Syri Hymni et Sermones*, 4 vols. (Mechelen: H. Dessain, 1902) 4:681-712 (*Hymni disperse* III-VIII). D. Hemmerdinger-Iliadou, *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* IV: 814, par. 9, no. 56.

³⁹ Section 8: "Beatus es, quia fuisti velut caput et lingua corpori fratrum tuorum, quod e discipulis compositum est." Compare CPG 4061's reference to Peter as τῶν μαθητῶν ἡ γλῶττα (Phrantzolas 116, 8).

⁴⁰ E.g., ὁ πρῶτος ἄρτος, ἄρτον παρὰ ἄρτου λαβὼν (Phrantzolas 119, 2-4). Cf. ἄρτον ἐπαγγελόμενος ὅσον μετὰ χειρὸς οὐκ ἔλαβεν (*In S. Andream* 2, 7). Both of these statements have Andrew as a subject and are comments on the Johannine account of the feeding of the five thousand, in which Andrew is mentioned (John 6:8-9).

tionship of some sort. On this basis alone it would be difficult to disagree with Aubineau's reluctance to see here evidence of a direct relationship between the two sermons, and still less possible to determine the direction of any such dependence. Yet there is at least one other point of contact with CPG 4061 and the writings of Hesychius of Jerusalem.⁴¹ As we have already noted, the extended section devoted to the apostle Thomas is largely an exegesis of Psalm 76:2-4. Referring this scriptural text to Thomas is not unknown outside this sermon, though apart from three brief references, one in the *Ancoratus* of Epiphanius of Salamis, another in a sermon of Pseudo-Chrysostom, and a third in a sermon of Severian of Gabala,⁴² the interpretation is only to be found in an exegetical work on the Psalms, the *Commentarius brevis* attributed to Hesychius.⁴³ Although the concise notes

⁴¹ In addition to the Thomas material adduced here, we read later in CPG 4061 the following formula introducing a scriptural citation, ὁ μέγιστος Ἡσαΐας τηλικαῦτα ἐσάλπισε (Phrantzolas 128, 7-8). Similarly, in another sermon of Hesychius's we read, Ἄκουε πάλιν ποῖα Ἡσαΐας ἐσάλπισεν (*Homilia ii in s. Pascha* 4, 8). According to a TLG search, these are the only two instances where Isaiah appears as the subject of this verb. Nevertheless, this might be a mere coincidence of two words, quite common in themselves, independently put together by two different authors.

⁴² "He was touched by Thomas so that he might not be compared with an illusion, but rather with the truth; he was believed by Thomas after the fulfillment of the prediction, *with my hands I sought God, and I was not deceived*." ψηλαφώμενος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θωμᾶ, ἵνα μὴ φαντασίᾳ ἀπεικασθῇ, ἀλλ' ἀληθείᾳ· ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Θωμᾶ πιστευθεὶς μετὰ τὸ πληρωθῆναι τὸ προειρημένον «ταῖς χερσὶ μου τὸν θεὸν ἐξεζήτησα, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην» (Epiphanius, *Ancoratus*, 80.5, 4-6, 3, in K. Holl, *Epiphanius, Band 1: Ancoratus und Panarion* [Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller 25; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915] 1-149, here p. 100, lines 21-24).

"After [attaining] certainty, it was fitting for the holy Thomas to speak the word of David, *In the day of my tribulation I sought God*, and since he searched with his hands to say what follows, *with my hands by night before him, and I was not deceived*." Ἐπρεπε τότε καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Θωμᾷ μετὰ τὴν πληροφορίαν εἰπεῖν τὸ τοῦ Δαυὶδ ῥητόν· Ἐν ἡμέρα θλίψεώς μου τὸν θεὸν ἐξεζήτησα· καὶ ἐπειδὴ χερσὶν ἠρεύνα, εἰπεῖν τὸ ἐπαγόμενον· Ταῖς χερσὶ μου νυκτὸς ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην (Severian of Gabala, *In ascensionem d.I.n.C. et in principium Actorum*, PG 52:779, end of section 5).

"Thomas the apostle says, *My Lord and my God*; just as the psalm also says, *With my hands I sought God, and I was not deceived*. Thomas touched the Logos in faithlessness, yet he was not deceived when he confessed him to be Lord and God in faith" Θωμᾶς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος· Ὁ Κύριός μου καὶ ὁ Θεός μου· καθὼς καὶ ὁ ψαλμωδὸς λέγει· Ταῖς χερσὶ μου τὸν θεὸν ἐξεζήτησα, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθην. Ἐψηλάφησεν ὁ Θωμᾶς τὸν Λόγον ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἠπατήθη Κύριον καὶ θεὸν ὁμολογήσας αὐτόν ἐν πίστει (Pseudo-Chrysostom, *De sancta trinitate*, PG 48:1089, 66-71).

⁴³ "Here the prophecy speaks about Thomas; when the Lord appeared to the disciples (apostles) and Thomas was not there, he grieved (was afflicted) exceedingly. *With my hands*. For he <the apostle Thomas> touched and was fully convinced with his hands and there was no falsehood in him. *It refused*, that is, *my soul* did not *suffer itself to be comforted*. For I know what is being sought (I know what I seek). *I remembered*. For I found <he received> wounds, in whom (all) the wounds of the whole race were obliterated. *I meditated*. When

of the *Commentarius brevis* do not exhibit verbal parallels with the much more developed treatment found in CPG 4061, it is clear the both authors interpreted the text along much the same lines. Unfortunately, the relevant portion of the more expansive psalm commentary attributed to Hesychius, the *Commentarius magnus*, remains unedited, as does the sermon on the apostle Thomas attributed to Basil of Seleucia (CPG 6668). There may well be some reason to posit a relationship between CPG 4061 and the writings of Hesychius, but whether the author of CPG 4061 was somehow dependent on them or Hesychius was somehow familiar with CPG 4061 is not possible to say. Hence the potential relationship between 4061 and the writings of Hesychius does not assist us in dating 4061.

Before finally turning to a comparative literary analysis of the block of material that CPG 6665 and 4061 share in common, there is one more issue that bears upon the question of the date of 4061. That issue is the appearance in the sermon of several comparatively late words or phrases. The sermon refers, for example, to the apostles as “select holy men” (ἱερῶν λογάδων [Phrantzolas 116, 5]); that expression does not seem to occur before the ninth century.⁴⁴ Similarly, Habakkuk is referred to as a great prophet (ὁ μέγιστος προφήτης Ἀββακούμ [Phrantzolas 126, 11-12]); the expression occurs only one other time, in Maximus the Confessor.⁴⁵ Towards the end of the sermon the preacher says of the Lord God Ἐκ τῶν κόλπων τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐξελεύσεται, καὶ οὐκ ἀναχωρήσει (Phrantzolas 128, 10-11). To come forth from God, or the Father, is a scriptural expression (John 8:42), as is being in the bosom of the Father (John 1:18), but

his fellow disciples said to him, *We have seen the Lord*, Thomas was deeply concerned, because he was not found with his fellow disciples” ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θλίψεως Ὡδε περὶ τοῦ Θωμᾶ ἡ προφητεία σημαίνει. ὅταν ὥφθη ὁ κύριος τοῖς μαθηταῖς (ἀποστόλοις) καὶ ὁ Θωμᾶς οὐκ ᾔην παρών, σφόδρα ἐλυπεῖτο (ἐθλίβετο). ταῖς χερσίν μου Ἐψηλάφησεν γὰρ καὶ ἐπληροφόρηθη ταῖς χερσὶ <ἀπόστολος Θωμᾶς> καὶ οὐκ ᾔην ψεῦδος ἐν αὐτῷ. ἀπηγγέματο Τουτέστιν οὐκ ἀνέχεται ἡ ψυχὴ μου παρακληθῆναι. ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνων τὸ ζητούμενον (οἶδα ὃ ζητῶ). ἐμνήσθην Εὐρόν <ἐλαβε> γὰρ μὴ ὥπως, ἐν ᾧ οἱ μὴ ὥπως παντὸς (πάντες) τοῦ γένους ἠφανίσθησαν. ἠδολέσχισα Ἡνίκα εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ συμμαθηταί. ἐώρακαμεν τὸν κύριον, ἐν πολλῇ φροντίδι ἐγένετο ὁ Θωμᾶς, ὅτι οὐχ εὗρέθη μετὰ τῶν συμμαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (Hesychius, *Commentarius brevis*, 76.3-4, in V. Jagic, *Supplementum Psalterii Bononiensis. Incerti auctoris explanatio Graeca* [Vienna: Holzhausen, 1917] 1-301). For assessment of the three works on the psalms attributed to Hesychius, see Marie-Josèphe Rondeau, *Les commentaires patristiques de psautier (IIIe-Ve siècles)*, vol. 1, *Les travaux des pères grecs et latins sur le psautier. Recherches et bilan*, Orientalia Christiana Analecta, 219 (Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1982) 137-43, esp. 142-43.

⁴⁴ οὐδαμῶς τοὺς ἱεροὺς καὶ λογάδας ἡμῶν πατέρας εὐρήσομεν διαμαχομένους ἀλλήλοις (Photius, *Bibliotheca*, codex 229; Henry 133, 27-29); διὰ τῶν ἱερῶν λογάδων (Arethras, *Scripta minora*, opus 8:87, 20; 9th-10th century); TLG also indicates a handful of occurrences in the 12th century and beyond.

⁴⁵ ὁ μέγας προφήτης Ἀββακούμ (*Quaestiones ad Thalassium* 55, 375).

to speak of coming forth from the bosom of the Father in these terms is both rare and late. Apart from the occurrence in this sermon it is only found three other times, twice in Symeon the New Theologian and once in Gregory Palamas.⁴⁶ The preacher also invokes “the glory of the fishermen” (ἀλιέων ἡ δόξα [Phrantzolas 129, 3]) as a witness; that expression occurs only one other time, again in Symeon the New Theologian.⁴⁷ The sermon concludes with a reference to the Spirit’s reformation of the preacher’s unsound tongue” (γλῶσσαν σαθράν [Phrantzolas 130, 8-9]). Closely comparable expressions occur only twice and not earlier than the late eighth century.⁴⁸ Although the expressions noted here are rare, and hence not as decisive as if we found in 4061 expressions that were common, but only in later time periods, they nevertheless suggest that a date after Basil of Seleucia is more plausible than one before him.

We finally turn to a comparative literary analysis of the block of material the two sermons share in common; the two passages are again set out in parallel columns and spaced so as to facilitate comparison. The salutations have been numbered for ease of reference, and below I refer to the numbered sections.

CPG 6665 (Marx 101,17-102,15)

1. Χαίρετε τοῦ Χριστοῦ βασιλεῖς
οἱ ἀπόστολοι· ὑμῖν γὰρ διὰ τῆς τοῦ
Πνεύματος χορηγίας τὴν ἄνω καὶ τὴν
κάτω βασιλείαν ἐπίστευσεν.

2. Χαίρετε τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς τὸ μηδέποτε
μαρανθῆναι δυνάμενον.

3. Χαίρετε τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τὸ μένον
ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ πανταχοῦ φωτίζον
τοὺς τυφλοὺς, τὸ χωρὶς
ὕλης καίόμενον, οὗ λύχνος ὁ Χριστός,

CPG 4061 (Phrantzolas 112,1-115,7)

1. Χαίρετε Χριστοῦ βασιλεῖς, ἄγιοι
Ἀπόστολοι· ὑμῖν γὰρ τὴν ἄνω καὶ κάτω
βασιλείαν ἐπίστευσε. Ἐκατέρους τοὺς
θρόνους οἰκονομεῖν καὶ ποιμαίνειν τὰ
σκῆπτρα παρέδωκε, τῆς κάτω μὲν τὸν
κληρὸν διορθωθῆναι βουλόμενος, τῆς
ἄνω δὲ τὴν δόξαν ἀστράψαι, τὸ ἄλλος
πλεονάσαι, φανερωθῆναι τὸ φῶς, γνω-
σθῆναι τὰ μυστήρια, κηρυχθῆναι τὴν
δύναμιν.

2. Χαίρετε, τὸ ἅλας τῆς γῆς, τὸ μηδέπο-
τε μαρανθῆναι δυνάμενον.

3. Χαίρετε, τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου, τὸ μένον
ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ λάμπον πανταχοῦ, τὸ
φωτίζον τοὺς ἐσκοτισμένους, τὸ χωρὶς
ὕλης καίόμενον· ὁ λύχνος ὁ Χριστός,

⁴⁶ ἐκ τῶν κόλπων τοῦ εὐλογημένου Πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἀνεκφοιτήτως ἐξεληθὼν (Symeon the New Theologian, *Orationes ethicae*, or. 7.1, 603); ὁ τοσοῦτου ὕψους ἐκ τοῦ εὐλογημένου κόλπου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐξεληθὼν ἀχωρίστως (ibid., or. 11.1, 246); Ἐξῆλθε δὲ παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν πατρικῶν κόλπων μὴ χωρισθείς (Gregory Palamas, *Homilia* 47.5, 20).

⁴⁷ εἰ μὴ οὕτω ἔλαβες δόξαν τῶν ἀλιέων (*Hymni* 21, 183).

⁴⁸ ἐξ ὀργάνου γλώττης σαθοῦ (Theodore the Studite, *Cantica*, 5.3, 5); μεθ’ οὕτω σαθοῦς τῆς γλώττης (Nicephorus Chumnus, *Epistulae* 32, 34; 13th-14th cent.).

CPG 6665 (Marx 101,17-102,15)

λυχνία δὲ ὁ σταυρός, ἔλαιον ἡ χορηγία τοῦ Πνεύματος.

4. Χαίρετε τοῦ κόσμου τὸ φῶς, ᾧ νῦξ πᾶσα παραχωρεῖ.

5. Χαίρετε τῶν ἱερέων οἱ σφραγισταί, τῶν διδασκάλων οἱ παιδευταί, τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγρευταί, τῶν ἐθνῶν οἱ σαγηνευταί, τῶν δικαίων οἱ ἀλεῖπται, τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν οἱ πλύται, τῆς ἁμαρτίας οἱ σφάκται, τῶν ἀπίστων οἱ φωτισταί, οἱ ἀήττητοι ῥήτορες, οἱ ἀβίαστοι κήρυκες, οἱ ἀνύστακτοι φύλακες.

6. Χαίρετε τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς οἱ χαλκευταί, τῆς ἁμαρτωλοῦ γλώσσης οἱ χορηγοί,

τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων οἱ τέκτονες.

7. Χαίρετε οἱ πῆραν οὐκ ἔχοντες καὶ πλούτου πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πληρώσαντες· οἷς οὐκ ἦν ῥάβδος περιττῆ καὶ πανταχόθεν τοὺς λύκους ἐδιώξατε· οἷς οὐκ ἦν δεύτερος χιτῶν, ἀλλὰ βασιλεῖς παρ' ὑμῶν ἐνεδύθησαν.

Ἡ θάλασσα

πεζεύοντας ὑμᾶς καθάπερ ὀλκάδας ἄρμενοφόρους ἐβάσταζεν· οἷς οὐκ ἦν ἄργυρος ἐν τῇ ζώνῃ οὐδὲ χρυσὸς ἔφερε τὸ βαλάντιον, ἀλλὰ πόδας μὲν ἐκ τῆς πῆρας τοῖς χωλοῖς ἐδανείζετε, ὑμῶν δὲ τῆς ζώνης τυφλὸς ἀψάμενος ἀριθμεῖν τὸν δρόμον τὸν ἡμερινὸν ἤρχετο

καὶ δακτυλοδεικτεῖν

ἀστέρας, οὓς οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε πρότερον.

8. Χαίρετε οἱ τοῦ διαβόλου συμποδισταί, τῶν δαιμόνων οἱ σκελισταί, οἱ καθαιρεταί τῆς πλάνης, οἱ τὴν ἀπάτην ἐκ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων λαξεύσαντες, ὧν τὰ σιμικίνθια μιμεῖται τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὰ κράσπεδα.

CPG 4061 (Phrantzolas 112,1-115,7)

λυχνία δὲ ὁ Πέτρος, ἔλαιον δὲ ἡ χορηγία τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος.

4. Χαίρετε, τοῦ κόσμου τὸ φῶς, ᾧ νῦξ πᾶσα παραχωρεῖ· οὐκ ἐπισκιάζει νεφέλη, οὐκ ἀντιβαίνει καταιγίς, οὐδὲ λαλία ψεπίκειται, τὸν ἀνάντιον δὲ τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐσκοτισμένα φωτίζεται, λευκαίνει τὰ κρυπτά, σμήχει τὰ λανθάνοντα, τὰ συνειδόμενα καθαίρει.

5. Χαίρετε, ἱερέων οἱ σφραγισταί, τῶν διδασκάλων οἱ παιδευταί, τῶν ἐθνῶν οἱ σαγηνευταί, τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγρευταί, τῶν δικαίων οἱ ἀλεῖπται, τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν οἱ πλύται, τῆς ἁμαρτίας οἱ σφάκται, τῶν ἀπίστων οἱ φωτισταί, οἱ ἀήττητοι φύλακες, οἱ πολυτελεῖς ἔμποροι.

6. Χαίρετε καὶ τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς οἱ χαλκευταί, τῆς ἁμαρτωλοῦ γλώττης οἱ χορηγοί, τῆς ἐμῆς ἀσθενείας οἱ δυναμωταί, τῆς ἐμῆς παρρησίας οἱ παιδοτρίβαι, τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων οἱ τέκτονες.

7. Χαίρετε, οἱ πῆραν μὴ ἔχοντες, καὶ πλούτου πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην πληρώσαντες· οἷς οὐκ ἦν ῥάβδος περιττῆ, καὶ πανταχόθεν τοὺς λύκους ἐδιώξατε· οἷς οὐκ ἦν δεύτερος χιτῶν, ἀλλὰ βασιλεῖς παρ' ὑμῶν ἐνεδύθησαν· οἷς οὐκ ἦν ὑποδήματα διπλᾶ, ἀλλὰ τὴν γῆν μὲν τοῖς δρόμοις ἐσαλεύσατε, νεφέλαι δὲ τοῖς ποσὶ τοῖς ὑμετέροις ὑπέτρεχον. Ἄγγελοι τὴν ὁδὸν ἔφανον εὐτρεπίζοντες, θάλαττα δὲ πεζεύοντας ὑμᾶς καθάπερ ὀλκάδας ἄρμενοφόρους ἐβάσταζεν. Οἷς οὐκ ἦν ἄργυρος ἐν τῇ ζώνῃ, οὐδὲ χρυσὸν ἔφερε τὸ βαλάντιον, ἀλλὰ πολλὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς πῆρας τοῖς χωλοῖς ἐδανείζετε· ὑμῶν δὲ τῆς ζώνης τυφλὸς ἄψας, ἀριθμεῖν τὸν δρόμον τῶν ἡμερῶν ἤρχετο, καὶ σταθμίζειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ δακτυλοδεικτεῖν ἀστέρας, οἷς οὐκ ἐγίνωσκε τὸ πρότερον.

8. Χαίρετε, οἱ τοῦ Διαβόλου συμποδισταί καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων σκελισταί, οἱ καθαιρέται τῆς πλάνης, οἱ τὴν ἀπάτην ἐκ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν ἡμετέρων λαξεύσαντες· ὧν τὰ σιμικίνθια μιμεῖται τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ κράσπεδα· ὧν αἱ σικιαὶ ἱατρεῖα πολλὰ καὶ διάφορα ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἅμα καὶ ταῖς χώραις ἀνέστησαν.

CPG 6665 (Marx 101,17-102,15)

9a. Χαίρετε οἱ τὸν θησαυρὸν εὐρόντες
τὸν ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ κρυπτόμενον καὶ τῇ
γυναικὶ τὴν δραχμὴν, ἣν ἀπώλεσε,
δείξαντες.

9b. Χαίρετε οἱ τὴν σαγήνην τὴν
ἐαυτῶν εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης
χαλάσαντες καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους
συναγαγόντες, οἱ θηράσαντες ἰχθύας,
οὓς μέχρι καὶ νῦν δειπνῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς
εὐφραίνεται.

10. Χαίρετε οἱ τὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον λίθον
πανταχοῦ τοῖς ὅμοις περιφέροντες καὶ
τῶν πιστῶν τοὺς οἴκους φωτίζοντες
καὶ στηρίζοντες τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ
σταυρωθέντος καὶ ἀποθανόντος καὶ
ἀναστάντος Χριστοῦ, ὃ πρέπει δόξα
[κράτος] νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

CPG 4061 (Phrantzolas 112,1-115,7)

9. Χαίρετε, οἱ τὸν θησαυρὸν εὐρόντες
τὸν ἐν ἄγρῳ κρυπτόμενον, οἱ τῇ γυναικὶ
τὴν δραχμὴν ἣν ἀπώλεσε δείξαντες,
οἱ διπλᾶ τῷ Χριστῷ προσενέγκαντες,
ἅπερ ἐπιστεύθητε τοῦ κηρύγματος
τάλαντα, οἱ τὴν σαγήνην τὴν ἐκ παντὸς
γένους συναγαγοῦσαν εἰς τὸν βυθὸν τῆς
οἰκουμένης χαλάσαντες, οἱ θηρεύσαντες
ἰχθύας, οὓς μέχρι καὶ νῦν δειπνῶν ἐν
οὐρανοῖς ὁ Βασιλεὺς εὐφραίνεται, οἱ
τὴν σοφὴν ποδὶ⁴⁹ τὰ τρία μέτρα τῶν
ἀλεύρων φυράσαι καὶ ζύμην μίαν
ἀπαρτίσαι διδάξαντες, οἱ τοὺς φραγμοὺς
συλήσαντες καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς βιασάμενοι
καὶ ἐρήμους θηράσαντες καὶ κλητῶν
τὰς παστάδας τοῦ γάμου τοῦ νυμφικοῦ
πληρώσαντες.

10. Χαίρετε, οἱ τὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον <εὐρό-
ντες> καὶ βασιλικοὺς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ νυμφῶ-
νας τοσοῦτους ἀναστήσαντες, τοσαύτας
ἐκκλησίας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐρανοῖς ὁμοίας
ἐγείραντες, τοσαῦτα θυσιαστήρια τῇ
θυσίᾳ <τῇ> ζωοτόκῳ περζάμενοι.

The most striking difference here is simply that this block of material is longer in CPG 4061 than in 6665. Much but not all of the additional material in 4061 comes at the end of the individual sections. So would an author have been more likely to abbreviate the longer text or augment the shorter one? Although not all the differences or even all the sections can be discussed here, a representative comparison of differences will serve to illumine the issue.

In the first section, then, the main difference is that 4061 has an extended statement that elaborates on the apostolic reign over the kingdom above and below. CPG 6665 is lacking this elaboration, but has instead an assertion that the entrusting of the kingdom to the apostles took place through the supply of the Spirit.⁵⁰ The text in 6665 is suitable to a sermon on Pentecost, while the text in 4061 is suitable to an encomium on the apostles,

⁴⁹ Perhaps read πῶς.

⁵⁰ The phrase "supply of the Spirit" (τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χορηγίας) is repeated in section three. Did the author of 4061 feel comfortable removing it since he knew it would be mentioned again later, or did the author of 6665 find it a convenient addition to the first section?

hence on this basis alone it is difficult to ascertain priority. One other difference, however, provides an additional clue. CPG 4061 refers to “holy apostles” (ἅγιοι Ἀπόστολοι) while 6665 refers simply to “the apostles” (οἱ ἀπόστολοι).⁵¹ The respective subjects of the two sermons notwithstanding, it seems more likely for the author of CPG 4061 to have added the adjective “holy” than for the author of 6665 to have removed it. That likelihood favors the priority of CPG 6665.

Section three, though short, contains a number of differences that together point to the priority of CPG 6665.⁵² For example, at the end of the section, we have the statement that “Christ is the lamp, the cross the lampstand, and the supply of the Spirit the oil.” In CPG 6665, this statement actually begins somewhat awkwardly with a genitive relative pronoun (οὗ) that refers ultimately back to “the light of the world” (τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου), mentioned at the beginning of the section. In CPG 4061, however, we have not the relative pronoun but simply the article (ὁ), which is more readily understandable, agreeing as it does with the word that follows it (λύχνος). Since the phrasing of 4061 at this point is an easier, clearer way to proceed grammatically speaking, it seems more likely for someone to have changed οὗ to ὁ than vice versa. Similar is the presence of the particle δὲ after the word ἔλαιον in 4061, which constitutes the second difference since the particle is not present in 6665. The particle’s presence in 4061 seems quite natural and helps to balance the components of the sentence. Hence it would again seem more likely for the author of 4061 to have inserted the δὲ than for the author of 6665 to have removed it. The third difference comes at the end of this sentence, where CPG 4061 refers to the Holy Spirit (τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος), while 6665 refers simply to the Spirit (τοῦ Πνεύματος). Here too it is easier to imagine the author of CPG 4061 inserting the adjective than to imagine the author of 6665 removing it. A fourth difference is also the most obvious: in 6665 the lampstand is the cross, while in 4061 the lampstand is Peter. Here we are fortunate to have previous scholarship to rely on. Michel Aubineau has shown that likening Christ to a lamp and the cross to a lampstand has its roots in a christological reading of Matt 5:15 and parallels (“Nor do people light a lamp [λύχνον] and put it under a basket, but on a stand

⁵¹ It is possible that this variation could be accounted for by the textual transmission of either sermon, but no textual variations are reported at this point by Marx, the editor of Basil’s sermon, though Marx did not include all possible manuscripts in his edition (cf. n. 54, below). As noted above, CPG 4061 was edited on the basis of one manuscript; hence there is no textual variation to report for that sermon.

⁵² Other differences are less decisive. It is admittedly difficult, for example, to make firm judgments based on either the variation in who is illumined in each sermon (6665: “the blind;” 4061: “the benighted”), or on the presence of an extra verb in 4061 (λάμπων).

[λυχνίαν]"); the christological interpretation of the parable was both geographically and chronologically widespread in patristic literature.⁵³ Peter, on the other hand, is clearly likened to a lampstand only here, according to a TLG search. It is therefore highly likely that CPG 6665 preserves the original statement, which the author of 4061 has altered in accordance with the theme of his sermon, an encomium on Peter and other apostles. These four differences, and particularly the last, are a strong indication of the priority of CPG 6665.

If sections one and three both favor the priority of CPG 6665, section five presents that hypothesis with a difficulty. That section describes the apostles as "unconquerable rhetors, irresistible heralds, and vigilant guardians" (οἱ ἀήττητοι ῥήτορες, οἱ ἀβίαστοι κήρυκες, οἱ ἀνύστακτοι φύλακες), a statement that in Greek is comprised of three metrically balanced rhyming phrases. In 4061, however, we read simply "unconquerable guardians, lavish merchants" (οἱ ἀήττητοι φύλακες, οἱ πολυτελεῖς ἔμποροι). It seems highly improbable that anyone with an appreciation for euphony would have changed the sonorous phrases of 6665 into the merely serviceable ones of 4061, an improbability that would favor the priority of 4061 rather than 6665. An explanation for this apparent difficulty, however, may reside in the textual transmission of CPG 6665. Marx reports that one of the witnesses for 6665, namely, *Vat. gr.* 1990, omits the preceding phrase, τῶν ἀπίστων οἱ φωτισταί, and instead of the succession ῥήτορες, κήρυκες, φύλακες, has ῥήτορες, ῥήτορες, φύλακες. If the author of 4061 had encountered similar textual confusion, he might well have chosen to excise the offending parts of the sentence and simply supply a concluding phrase ("lavish merchants" οἱ πολυτελεῖς ἔμποροι); this state of affairs would explain the variation between the two sermons at this point without forcing us to presuppose the priority of 4061.⁵⁴

⁵³ Aubineau, *Homélies pascales*, 76-80. See also Daniel Sheerin, "The Theotokion 'Ω τήν εὐλογημένην; Its Background in Patristic Exegesis of Luke 15:8-10, and Western Parallels" *Vigiliae Christianae* 43 (1989), 166-187, esp. 174-75.

⁵⁴ It is certainly not the case that the author of 4061 looked at *Vat. gr.* 1990, since 4061 has the phrase τῶν ἀπίστων οἱ φωτισταί, and *Vat. gr.* 1990 does not, as Marx reports. But the textual confusion might have crept into the manuscript tradition at an earlier point than *Vat. gr.* 1990. There are two other variations in section five which might seem to favor the priority of 4061, but are probably better explained by referring the variations to the textual transmission. First, in 6665 we read at the outset of section five τῶν ἱερέων, while the corresponding passage in 4061 has simply ἱερέων, which is out of keeping with the other gentives in the remainder of the section in either sermon. Its removal seems unlikely, but so does an original composition without the article, hence the variation may be due to the textual transmission of one or the other of the sermons. Marx does not report a variant reading at this point, but his edition relies on only two manuscripts, while eighteen witnesses are currently known (Tevel, 94-96). Section five of 6665 goes on to describe the apostles as those

The seventh in this series of salutations exhibits a number of variations both large and small between the two sermons, but only a few of these variations shed any light on the question of priority. In both sermons the section is structured by repetition of the phrase οἷς οὐκ ἦν (6665: 3×; 4061: 4×). In both sermons this structuring device is somewhat awkwardly interrupted in the middle of the section by a sentence that does not depend on that device. In 4061 the sentence runs, “Angels appeared to prepare your way, and the sea supported you moving by foot, just as it does sail-bearing vessels.” In 6665 the first phrase does not appear, so that the sentence is entirely about the sea. It is perhaps easier to imagine someone supplying 6665 with some additional context than to imagine someone removing that context, a supposition which favors the priority of 6665. A similar analysis applies to an admittedly unusual expression in CPG 6665, “you [sc. apostles] bestowed feet (πόδας) on the lame from your knapsack.” In 4061, on the other hand, we read, “you bestowed many things (πολλὰ) on the lame from your knapsack.” If this variation is not a result of textual corruption, it would seem easier to imagine someone changing πόδας to πολλὰ than the reverse. By contrast when the blind man is said to touch the belt (τῆς ζώνης) of the apostles, 6665 has the common form of the verb ἀψάμενος, while 4061 has the less common active form (ἔψα). By the logic we have been applying so far, this variation should favor the priority of 4061, since it is easier to imagine someone replacing an uncommon form with a common one than vice versa.

Like section seven, section nine exhibits variations both large and small between the two sermons. Most obvious is that 6665 has two salutations beginning with Χαίρετε whereas 4061 has one. It is difficult to decide whether the two salutations of 6665 are its author’s attempt to rationalize the rather long catalogue in 4061 by devoting one salutation to two parables dealing with finding something of value and another salutation to fishing imagery, or whether the author of 4061 thought it good to combine all these allusions to parables under one salutation and then fill out that

“who catch the peoples” (τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγρευταί) while in 4061 the apostles are described as those “who speak for the peoples” (τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγορευταί). While the verb ἀγορεύω is common, the noun ἀγορευτής, and the related adjective ἀγορευτός, are together quite rare. The only other occurrences I have located are Justin Martyr, *Dial.* 4.1,9 (cited in Lampe, s.v.) and *POxy.* 1590.1 (cited in LSJ, s.v.). Hence it would seem more probable for someone to have changed the uncommon word (ἀγορευταί) into the common one (ἀγρευταί) than vice versa. This probability would favor the priority of 4061. Nonetheless the words are so close to each other in form that this is probably just an instance of variation in the textual transmission, though Marx does not report any such variants. Or perhaps the author of 4061 felt that having two fishing metaphors in a row (τῶν λαῶν οἱ ἀγρευταί, τῶν ἔθνῶν οἱ σαγγρευταί) was repetitive and so proposed his own emendation, changing ἀγρευταί to ἀγορευταί.

list with a few more parable allusions.⁵⁵ Despite this difficulty, one specific point of comparison points to the priority of 6665. In that sermon, the apostles are addressed as “you who let down your net into the depths of the world and gathered in from every race.” In 4061 we read something slightly different, “who let down the net, which gathered in from every race, into the depths of the world.” So in 6665 it is the apostles who gather, while in 4061 it is actually the net that gathers. If 4061 is indeed adapting 6665, we might have expected the author of 4061 to retain the emphasis on the apostles. Another factor, however, would appear to be at work. The underlying scriptural source here is Matt 13:47, where the kingdom of heaven is likened to a net (σαγήνη) that is cast into the sea and that gathers in from every race (καὶ ἐκ παντὸς γένους συναγαγούσῃ).⁵⁶ Once again, it is easier to envision the author of 4061 reworking the statement in 6665 to bring it more in line with the underlying scriptural text than it is to envision the author of 6665 departing from the more precise allusion of 4061.

Finally, in the tenth section we have two quite different appropriations of cornerstone imagery. CPG 4061 speaks rather conventionally about building on a cornerstone, while 6665 has the apostles carrying the cornerstone around on their shoulders. Here too it is easier to imagine the author of 4061 altering the unusual imagery of 6665 to something more conventional than it is to imagine the reverse.

So then, with a few notable but not overpowering exceptions, detailed comparison of these two texts suggests that the author of 4061 expanded and revised the material he found in 6665. Most of these points of comparison are in themselves of little weight, but taken together they point towards the priority of 6665. Moreover the substitution of Peter for the cross in section three would appear to tip the scale decisively in favor of the priority of CPG 6665.

5. Conclusion

We are now in a position to draw some general conclusions. In the first place, both 6665 and 6666 are authentic. This article confirms on the basis

⁵⁵ In both sermons this section contains a repetition of masculine plural participles accompanied by the article οἱ and ending in -ντες. This pattern is more striking in 4061 since there are more instances to reinforce it, though towards the end of the section βιασάμενοι breaks that pattern.

⁵⁶ In its original context ἐκ παντὸς γένους probably refers, in the first instance, to different kinds of fish, and it is frequently so translated, but it also seems clear that both sermons take the words in a broader way.

of internal evidence what has generally been held on the basis of external evidence.

With regard to the relationship between 6665 and 4537, there are two possibilities as to dating. If on the one hand we suppose that 6665 is later than 4537, then the relationship between 6666 and 4537 would confirm that Basil was familiar with 4537. This supposition about relative dating, however, runs into several difficulties. Why is the litany not better contextualized in 4537? More especially, why would Basil take a twelve-membered litany on the twelve apostles and reduce it to an eight-membered litany on the twelve apostles? If on the other hand we suppose that 6665 is earlier than 4537, then the relationship between 4537 and 6666 would make it all but certain that 6665 was the source of the litany in 4537. On the whole this is the most satisfying explanation of the available data: 4537 borrowed from 6665. Note that this conclusion does not require us to suppose that Basil originally composed the litany himself. Certainty on that matter eludes us, but there would appear to be some reason to doubt that he did.

With regard to the relationship between 6665 and 4061, comparative literary analysis makes it likely that 6665 is the source of 4061. Nevertheless both the paucity of parallels between the block of material that the two sermons have in common and the rest of Basil's corpus, as well as the presence of phrases and terms not found elsewhere in that corpus, suggest that Basil did not compose the passage originally.

Basil then is very likely the source for both 4537 and 4061; hence those two sermons are relatively early instances of the reception of Basil's sermons in the Greek homiletical tradition. Such literary units seem to have lent themselves to recycling and repurposing, so it may well be that Basil borrowed them from sources not known to us. If Basil did borrow both passages, it would mean that in this authentic sermon of Basil's, about half of it was not originally composed by him. And in that respect, though Marx proved to be wrong in denying the Basilian authorship of CPG 6665, he nevertheless had a point.

Appendix: Internal Evidence for the Basilian Authorship of CPG 6666

For the textual transmission of CPG 6666 see Tevel, *De Preken van Basilius*. As is well known among students of this literature, Marx at first attributed this sermon, which is printed twice in the PG on the basis of different manuscripts (PG 52:809-12; 64:417-24), to Proclus; when he turned his attention to the sermons of Basil of Seleucia, he attributed the same sermon to that author, without any reference to his former opinion.⁵⁷ In the article on Basil, Marx deals only with the text as we have it in PG 64:417-424, and that may be part of the explanation for his apparent forgetfulness. One indication of the subjective nature of Marx's enterprise is that he cites the same set of rhyming isocola as characteristic of each author's style.⁵⁸ This article concurs with Marx's later opinion as to the authorship of CPG 6666; supporting that concurrence and filling out the rather minimal amount of internal evidence that Marx adduced are the following textual parallels. Parallels from CPG 6665, which have already been reported in the body of the present article, are not included below.

Πόθεν γὰρ ἄλλοθεν αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλαι τῇ εἰδωλολατρείᾳ νοσοῦσαι πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν ἔδραμον; (PG 52:809, 52-54) // ὅτε μερίζονται τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλαι, τίς ποίᾳ μερίδι ἀποκεκλήρωται; (PG 85:460, 45-46); ἐποπτεύει τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀγέλας (PG 28:1108, 40).

Ὁ μὲν οὖν Ἰησοῦς ἀνθρωπίνην τὴν φύσιν λαβὼν καὶ συγγενῇ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις περιβαλλόμενος θέναν (PG 52:809, 68-70) // καὶ φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη Θεῷ ἡνωμένη τὸν ἄδην κατέπληττεν (PG 28:1080, 13-14); cf. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αἰσχρόν τι τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως, παρὰ φρονίμοις τοῖς ἀληθείας κριταῖς (PG 85:437, 24-25), which, however, does not refer to the human nature of Christ.

πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑποδοχὴν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀνέστησεν (PG 52:809, 70-71) // εἶδον, ὦ προφῆτα, ψυχὴν, πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ὑποδοχὴν εὐτρεπῇ (PG 85:185, 4-5).

Ἐλεύσεται μετ' ἐμὲ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ τὴν οὐσίαν· παραγενήσεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς τὸ ἐκ Πατρὸς τῷ Πατρὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐφάμιλλον (PG 52:810, 49-51). // Ὡς γὰρ ἄνθρωπος

⁵⁷ Marx, *Untersuchung*, 49 (no. 42); "Der homiletische Nachlass des Basileios von Seleukia" *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 7 (1941) 329-369; esp. 346, 358-59. The two pieces were published only a year apart, though one supposes that the underlying work may have been separated by some years. The text of PG 52:809-12 is based on *Vindobonensis Theol. gr.* 189 (ff. 266-268^v; 16th cent.); that of PG 64:417-24, originally published by Cardinal Angelo Mai, is "presumably based on *Vaticanus gr.* 1587" (ff. 362-364^v; dated 1389). So Tevel, *Preken*, 97, n. 2.

⁵⁸ καὶ πίστις ἐδιδάσκετο, καὶ χάρις ἐθαυμάζετο, καὶ Θεὸς ἐγνώριζετο (PG 52:812, 27-28; 64:421c), cited in Marx, *Untersuchung*, 49, and in Marx, "Der homiletische Nachlass," 359.

ἐξ ἀνθρώπου, οὕτω φέρω πρὸς τὸν ἑμαυτοῦ Πατέρα τὸ τῆς οὐσίας ἐφάμιλλον (PG 85:297, 12-14).⁵⁹

Οὐκοῦν ἂ τοῖς λόγοις εὐηγγελίσθησαν, τοῖς ἔργοις ἐπέγνωσαν. ὦν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἐδέξαντο, τούτων τὴν πείραν ἐνέμενον (PG 52:810, 52-54) // γέγονέ μοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἡ φαντασία διὰ τῆς πείρας ἀλήθεια (PG 28:1093, 9-10). Cf. Καὶ γέγονεν ἡ ἀνάστασις γνώσις, τῇ πείρᾳ τοῦ θαύματος τὴν ἄγνοιαν λύσασα (PG 85:292, 21-22).

Ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἀποστόλων χορὸς τῆς ὑποσχέσεως τῆς δεσποτικῆς, καθάπερ ἀγκύρας τινός, ἐπιλαβόμενος, τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος παρουσίαν ἀνέμενε (PG 52:810, 58-60) // See the instances recorded on p. 125.

Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ σταυρὸς ἐπάγη, καὶ τὸ πάθος ὑψώθη, καὶ θεατῆς ἦν μέχρι τούτων ἅπας τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὁ δῆμος (PG 52:811, 15-17). // Μωϋσέα δὲ διδάσκαλον ἔπεμπε, καὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίων δῆμοις κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον παιδευτῆς ὁ Μωϋσῆς ἐκαθέζετο (PG 85:368, 30-32). Cf. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ πολὺς τῶν θαυμάτων ὄμιβρος δῆμον Ἰουδαϊκὸν πρὸς πίστιν οὐκ ἐδυσώπησεν (PG 85:245, 49-51); Καὶ τί σμικρύνω τὸν ἔπαινον, αὐτοῦ σαφῶς τοῦ Δεσπότου ἐν μέσῳ δῆμων Ἰουδαϊκῶν τὸν ἐθνικὸν εὐφημήσαντος; (PG 85:241, 10-12).

ἐπιτηροῦσα τὸν καιρὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς μαθητάς ἡ χάρις ἐκχεῖται, καὶ τοὺς ἀπάντων ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἀκοὰς ἐπιστρέφει (PG 52:811, 21-23) // λοχῶσα τοὺς χρόνους, ἐπιτηροῦσα καιροὺς, παρακαλοῦσα συνεχῶς (PG 85:120, 8-9). Cf. ποσάκις Ἰουδαίοις κηρύξας, τὰς ἀκοὰς οὐκ ἐπέστρεψας; (PG 85:164, 24-25).

Οὕτως ἄρα⁶⁰ ποτὲ καὶ κατὰ τὸ Σιναῖον ὄρος ἡ φλόξ ἐτινάσσετο, καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἐν μέσῳ πυρὸς νομοθετεῖν ἐδιδάσκετο (PG 52:811, 29-32). // ἡνίκα τὸ Σιναῖον ὄρος ἀνελθεῖν ἐπετάττετο τὰς δακτύλῳ Θεοῦ γεγραμμένας πλάκας (PG 85:428, 20-21); Πάλαι μὲν οὖν ἐν ἐρήμῳ, διὰ Μωϋσέως νομοθετῶν ὁ Θεός, πυρὶ τὸ Σίναιον περιέβαλεν ὄρος (PG 85:361, 14-16).

Ὁ γὰρ τότε Μωϋσέα ταῖς εἰς Ἑβραίους νομοθεσίαις κινήσας αὐτὰ εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν σωτηρίαν (PG 52:811, 33-35) // Ἔτι προτιμᾷς τὴν φυγὴν τῆς τῶν ἐθνῶν σωτηρίας; (PG 85:180, 30-31); Cf. διδάξει προφήτας βουλούμενος, πόσω τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὰ ἔθνη πρὸς σωτηρίαν εὐγνωμονέστερα (PG 85:177, 14-15); Διὰ τοῦτο νῦν ἀποστέλλει τὸν Ἰωάννην, προαનોίγοντα τοῖς ἔθνεσι τῆς σωτηρίας τὰς πύλας (PG 85:177, 12-14); πᾶσιν ἀπλώσει τοῖς ἔθνεσι τὰς τῆς σωτηρίας ἐλπίδας (PG 85:181, 7-8).

⁵⁹ The use of the terms οὐσία and ἐφάμιλλον, ον to describe the equality between the Father and the Son occurs nowhere else in the TLG. These two occurrences then are a good indication of common authorship. Marx notes other Basilian instances of ἐφάμιλλον being used with ἀξία (PG 85:417c) and τιμή (85:285a), "Der homiletische Nachlass," 359.

⁶⁰ The phrase οὕτως ἄρα occurs five times in Basil's writings (the other four are: PG 85:64, 19-20, 25-26; 320, 21-22, 33) and is fairly common outside them. In Chrysostom, by contrast, it occurs only once (*In epistulam i ad Timotheum* [homiliae 1-18]; PG 62:545, 53).

διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παλαιῶν μνήμη θαυμάτων⁶¹ τοῖς νέοις ἀνεμίγνυτο· καὶ πάλιν μεσιτεύει τὸ πῦρ τῷ παραπλησίῳ τῆς θέας τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον εἶναι Θεὸν τοῖς παροῦσι πιστούμενον (PG 52:811, 35-38) // Τοῦτου τοῦ θαύματος τὴν μνήμην κατέχωμεν (PG 85:101, 15); οὐ μόνον τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐγέννα τὴν μνήμην τοῦ θαύματος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ πεποιηκότος τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐνεφάνιζεν (PG 85:365, 11-13); Ἵνα δὲ μὴ χρόνος πάλιν ἐν μέσῳ ῥέων πολὺς κατακλύσῃ τὴν μνήμην τοῦ θαύματος (PG 28:1096, 46-48). Cf. Ἰσάριθμοι γὰρ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οἱ κόφιοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος ἕνα βαστάζων, ἔχῃ τὸν πόνον τοῦ θαύματος μάρτυρα, . . . καὶ φυλάττῃ τὴν μνήμην ὁ κόπος (PG 85:364, 41-45). // Θαυμάζων δὲ τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτὸν ὁ Θεὸς, μισθὸν αὐτῷ τῆς γνώμης τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπιφάνειαν δείκνυσι, καὶ μεσιτεύει τῇ θέᾳ τῷ θεατῇ τὸ πῦρ βάτῳ καὶ ἀνθεσιν ἀβλαβῶς ἐποχοῦμενον (PG 85:301, 6-9).

Πρὸς δὲ γλώσσας μεριζομένη τορνεύεται, ἵνα διδασκάλους τοὺς ὑποδεχομένους ἐργάσῃται, ἵν' ἐν πυρὶ πορευόμενοι παιδευταὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὑπάρξωσι (PG 52:811, 39-41; cf. χάρις . . . ἡ τοῦ ἀγραμμάτου τῷ κόσμῳ παιδευτὰς ἐπιστήσασα [809, 48-50]) // ὁ Παῦλος ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης παιδευτής (PG 28:1097, 52-53).⁶² Πάλαι μὲν οὖν⁶³ μίαν φωνὴν τε καὶ γλῶσσαν ἀπάντων ὑπάρχουσαν ἡ πάλαι τῆς πυργοποιίας διεμεμέριστο τόλμα (PG 52:811, 42-44) // Πάλαι μὲν οὖν ἐν ἐρήμῳ (PG 85:361, 14-15); Πάλαι μὲν οὖν σοι φυτὸν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ Ἀδάμ αἵρεσιν ἤρκεσεν (PG 28:1092, 42-43).

᾽Ω τῶν παραδόξων θαυμάτων! (PG 52:811, 53) // See p. 125 for parallels in Basil's writings.

Ἡ μὲν οὖν τοῦ πυρὸς φύσις μεριζομένη πολυπλασιάζει τὴν ἐνέργειαν. Πηγὴ γὰρ φωτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος (PG 52:812, 5-7) // Ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ φωτὸς παρούσα πηγὴ τυφλῷ τὴν αὐγὴν ἐχαρίζετο (PG 85:373, 42-43) // Ἀλλ' ὁ πέντε ἄρτοις πεντακισχιλίους χορτάσας, καὶ τὴν τῶν μαθητῶν πενίαν τῷ πλοῦτῳ τῆς χάριτος διορθώσάμενος (PG 85:84, 47-49).

Μία μὲν λαμπὰς μυρίους ἀποτεκοῦσα πυρσοὺς (PG 52:812, 9). See remarks on p. 127.

Καὶ θέατρον ἦσαν οἱ παρόντες τοῦ θαύματος (PG 52:812, 22) // Τὴν ἐκκλησίαν θέατρον ἀγγέλων τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἐπίκοινον εἰπὼν τις, οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι . . . θέατρον, ἐν ᾧ τὰ δεσποτικὰ θαύματα ἄσματα τερπνὰ ταῖς ἀκοαῖς ἐξυφαίνεται (Cunningham 1, 1-5); ἃ γὰρ ἐβλεπον [sc. Ἰουδαῖοι] θαύματα, ταῦτα μὴ βλέπειν προσεπειοῦντο. Ἀλλ' οὐ τοιοῦτον τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὸ θέατρον (Cunningham 1, 11-2, 1).

⁶¹ The phrase occurs again near the end of the sermon: ἵνα τὴν μνήμην τῶν θαυμάτων φυλάττοντες, τῆς χάριτος τὸ κέρδος τρυγήσωμεν (PG 52:812, 51-52).

⁶² On the expression “educator(s) of the world” see the discussion on p. 136-37 of this article.

⁶³ According to the TLG, this phrase occurs seventy-eight times, but not at all, for example, in Chrysostom.

Ὡς τῆς συντροφου τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀγνωμοσύνης! Ἐννόει τὸν καιρὸν, ὦ Ἰουδαῖε, καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν συκοφαντοῦσαν ἀνάστελλε (PG 52:812, 31-34). // Καὶ μοι σκόπησον τὸ διάφορον τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀγνωμοσύνης πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας εὐγνωμοσύνην οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὁμμασιν ὀρώντες τὰ θαύματα συκοφαντίᾳ καλύπτειν ἐμνηχανῶντο (Cunningham 1, 6-9); Δεῖξον Ἰουδαίους συκοφαντοῦσι τὴν ἀνάστασιν (PG 85:260, 12-13).

ἔαρος δὲ ἄρτι φανέντος, ποῦ χώραν ἔχει⁶⁴ γλεύκους ἡ μνήμη; (PG 52:812, 35-36) // Τὸ φίλτρον ἐκούσιον, καὶ τὸ πάθος ἀβούλητον; Ποῦ δὲ χώραν ἡ περιφανῆς ἔχει φωνή· Ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τίθησι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων; (PG 85:353, 31-34).

Ἄλλ' ἄρα μὴ συνέσταλται πάλιν τὸ ῥεῖθρον; ἢ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους περιγράφεται μόνον τὸ δῶρον; Οὐμενοῦν.⁶⁵ (PG 52:812, 45-47) // ἄρα μόνους οὐρανὸς τοῦς ἀποστολούς ἐκδέχεται, καὶ μέχρῃς αὐτῶν περιγράφεις τὸ δῶρον; (PG 85:324, 23-25).⁶⁶

Ἐκχεῶ, φησὶν, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα. Μαθόντες τὴν προῤῥήσιν, ὁρᾶτε τὴν ἐκβασιν (PG 52:812, 47-48) // Πῶς οὖν τῶν προφητῶν αἱ προῤῥήσεις ἐκβάσεις λήψονται; (PG 85:345, 47)

Προέλαβε τὴν προφητικὴν γλῶτταν ἡ γλῶσσα τοῦ Πνεύματος (PG 52:812, 48-49). // ὁ προφητικῆς γλῶττης ἀπείρατος τὸν Ἰουδαῖον τῇ πίστει νενίκηκε (PG 85:241, 15-17); also in PG 85:156, 23 (singular) and in PG 85:177, 3-4; 205, 3-4; 304, 1 (plural).

αὐτῷ [sc. Θεὸς] ἡ <δόξα> καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (PG 52:812, 54-56). // δόξαν ἀναπέμφωμεν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ Υἱῷ, καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (PG 85:148, 9-11).⁶⁷

⁶⁴ According to the TLG, the phrase occurs thirty-two other times, only two of which are prior to Basil: Eusebius, *Commentaria in Psalmos* (PG 23:312, 30-31); Didymus the Blind, *In Genesim*, codex 137, line 11 (L. Doutreleau and P. Nautin, *Didyme L'Aveugle. Sur la Genèse*, vols. 1-2 [Sources chrétiennes 233, 244. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1976, 1978]). The expression "to have place" χώραν ἔχει (without ποῦ) occurs three times in Basil's writings (Cunningham 4, 9; PG 85:336, 41; PG 28:1089, 28-29) and is quite common outside them.

⁶⁵ In Basil's writings the word οὐμενοῦν occurs twice in connected (PG 28:1096, 31; PG 85:429, 18) and twice in unconnected form (PG 85:220, 11; 361, 31). According to the TLG, both forms are exceedingly common outside Basil's writings, with the connected form being more prevalent in later periods, though neither form seems to occur, for example, in Chrysostom.

⁶⁶ δῶρον as subject or object of the verb περιγράφω occurs only one other time in the TLG (Nicetas David, *Homiliae septem* 4.255, 4 in F. Lebrun, *Nicetas le Paphlagonien. Sept homélies inédites* [Leuven, 1997]). Hence the two occurrences listed above are a significant indication of the Basilian authorship of CPG 6666.

⁶⁷ In Basilian doxologies, the combination of δόξα and κράτος occurs twenty-two times; in the doxology of CPG 6666, PG 52:812, 54 has δύναμις instead of δόξα (PG 64:424, 10), but δύναμις occurs in no other Basilian doxology; hence we should probably read here δόξα

Abstract

Primarily on the basis of external evidence, two festal sermons on Pentecost are attributed to the fifth-century bishop and homilist, Basil of Seleucia, by the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (6665 and 6666), an attribution confirmed by Johannes Marius Tevel's exhaustive study of the manuscript tradition of Basil's sermons. This article defends the Basilian authorship of CPG 6665 on the basis of internal evidence, *pace* its first editor, Benedikt Marx, who attributed the sermon to Proclus of Constantinople. The article also assesses a block of material contained both in CPG 6665 and in CPG 4537, a Pentecost sermon of Pseudo-Chrysostom, as well as a second block of material contained both in CPG 6665 and in CPG 4061, an encomium on six apostles, assigned to Ephrem Graecus. Arguments are advanced for the priority of CPG 6665 in both cases, but left open is the possibility that neither block of material is an original composition of Basil. An appendix to the article contains a demonstration of the Basilian authorship of CPG 6666 on the basis of internal evidence.

with PG 64:424, 10. Among Basil's writings, the phrase εἰς τοὺς ἀτελευτήτους αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων occurs only in the two instances cited above.

Merkmale der theologischen Argumentation in den Katechetischen Homilien des Severus von Antiochien¹

René ROUX

(Erfurt)

Das Interesse an Werk und Gestalt des Severus von Antiochien ist im Laufe des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts ständig gewachsen². Einerseits dank der unermüdlichen Arbeit von Lebon, Graffin, Brière und anderen, die die Schriften des Severus ediert und übersetzt haben, ist sein theologisches Schrifttum den Historikern und den Dogmatikern zum größten Teil zugänglich gemacht worden³. Ein tieferes Verständnis seiner christologischen Lehre hat die Annäherung zwischen der römisch-katholischen Kirche und der Koptischen sowie der Syro-orthodoxen Kirche, die Severus als ihren großen Kirchenlehrer betrachten, erstmal nach 1500 Jahren wieder ermöglicht⁴. Andererseits haben sich seine Briefe und seine Predigten als eine einmalige Quelle für das Studium des alltäglichen Lebens der christlichen Gemeinden Anfang des sechsten Jahrhunderts erwiesen⁵. Seine

¹ Eine erste Fassung dieses Aufsatzes wurde bei der von Johan Leemans organisierten Tagung „Die altkirchliche Predigt als *locus theologicus*“ (Erfurt 2007) vorgetragen. Meinem ehemaligen römischen Lehrer Basil Studer (*in memoriam*) sowie Pauline Allen sei an dieser Stelle für ihre bereichernden Anmerkungen und Anregungen besonders gedankt.

² Cfr. die umfassende Studie von F. ALPI, *La route royale. Sévère d'Antioche et les Églises d'Orient (512-518)*. Vol. I. *Texte* (besonders pp. 68-69; 138; 144-147; 278-280); vol. II. *Sources et documents*, Beyrouth, 2009, mit ausführlicher Bibliographie. Eine ausgezeichnete Einführung bietet P. ALLEN – C.T.R. HAYWARD, *Severus of Antioch*, London, 2004, mit Anthologie.

³ Zur Orientierung über das Labyrinth der Werke und Ausgaben unentbehrlich: CPG III (u. Supplementum), 7022-7081; F. ALPI, *La route royale*, vol. II. *Sources et documents*, pp. 5-12.

⁴ Cfr. zum Beispiel, die gemeinsame Deklaration, die Papst Paul VI. und Papst Shenouda III. am 10. Mai 1973 unterschrieben haben: *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 64 (1979) 299-301.

⁵ Cfr. P. ALLEN, „Severus of Antioch and pastoral care“, in *Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church*, eds. P. ALLEN – W. MAYER – L. CROSS, vol. 2, Brisbane, 1999, pp. 387-400; id., „Severus of Antioch as pastoral carer“, in *Studia Patristica* 35, Leuven, 2001, pp. 356-368; id., „Severus of Antioch as a source for lay piety in late antiquity“, in *Historiam perscrutari. Miscellanea di studi offerti al prof. Ottorino Pasquato* – ed. M. MARITANO, Rome, 2002, pp. 711-721; P. ALLEN – W. MAYER, „Through a bishop's eyes: towards a definition of pastoral

exegetischen Schriften, in denen die traditionellen Tendenzen der alexandrinischen und der antiochenischen Schule sich miteinander verbinden, und seine souveräne Beherrschung der Bibel und der Schriften der Kirchenväter haben seine Leser, in der Antike⁶ so wie heute⁷, zum Erstaunen gebracht. Wenn auch seine christologische Auffassung bis in die kleinsten Nuancen endgültig geklärt zu sein scheint, bleiben jedoch viele Fragen im Bereich seiner theologischen Methode offen. Wer die Lektüre der theologischen Abhandlungen des Severus wagt – es ist hier daran zu erinnern, dass Severus uns das bei weitem umfangreichste Werk über die Christologie der ganzen christlichen Antike hinterlassen hat – der wird in den Arbeiten von Lebon⁸ oder Grillmeier⁹ wichtige Hinweise finden, um die genaue Bedeutung der christologischen Aussagen des Severus zu verstehen, aber kaum ein Wort über die Wege seines theologischen Denkens. Auf der Basis neuerer Erkenntnisse im Rahmen seiner exegetischen Methode¹⁰ und seines Orthodoxiebegriffs¹¹ wird hier versucht, die Merkmale seiner theologischen Argumentation in den Katechetischen Homilien zu untersuchen. Die Art und Weise einer theologischen Argumentation hängt nicht nur vom abgehandelten Thema ab, sondern auch vom historischen und existentiellen Kontext, von der Zielgruppe und insbesondere von der jeweils gewählten literarischen Gattung. Wegen ihrer inhaltlichen und strukturellen Einheit bilden die sechs Katechetischen Homilien eine einmalige Quelle, um einige Aspekte der *mens theologica* des Severus zu beobachten: Erstens, im Gegensatz zu den dogmatischen Schriften versucht Severus hier, den gesamten christlichen Glauben darzustellen. Die äußerst kontroversen christologischen Fragen werden freilich nicht vernachlässigt, aber in einem breiteren Kontext der gesamten christlichen Botschaft eingebettet, so dass das Verständnis des Severus vom Wesen des Christentums besser als in seinen polemischen Schriften zum Vorschein kommt. Diesbezüglich

care in late antiquity”, *Augustinianum* 40 (2000) pp. 245-297; P. ALLEN, „Severus of Antioch as Theologian, Dogmatician, Pastor, and Hymnographer. A Consideration of His Work on the Feast of the Ascension“, *Questions liturgiques* 92 (2011), pp. 361-375, bes. p. 363.

⁶ Cfr. Iohannes Bar-Aphthonia, *Octoechus in Severum patriarcham* – ed. M.-A. Kugener, Paris, 1904 (PO 2), pp. 327-328.

⁷ Cfr. F. GRAFFIN, „La catéchèse de Sévère d'Antioche“, *L'orient syrien* 5 (1960), pp. 47-54; zur Interpretationsgeschichte und Würdigung der Predigten des Severus in der heutigen Forschung, cfr. ALLEN, „Severus of Antioch as Theologian“, p. 363, n. 10.

⁸ Cfr. J. LEBON, *Le monophysisme sévérien*, Louvain, 1909.

⁹ Cfr. A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/2, Freiburg, 1989, pp. 19-185.

¹⁰ Cfr. R. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche*, Rome, 2002.

¹¹ Cfr. R. ROUX, „The Concept of Orthodoxy in the Cathedral Homilies of Severus of Antioch“, in *Studia Patristica* 35, Leuven, 2001, pp. 487-493.

ermöglicht die Gattung der „Katechese“ eine systematische und organische Darstellung der christlichen Lehre, während die Predigten für liturgische Feste oder zu besonderen Bibelstellen vom konkreten Anlass oder von der jeweiligen Perikope bestimmt sind¹². Zweitens, da die Adressaten das allgemeine Publikum oder, besser gesagt, das einfache Kirchenvolk und nicht die theologisch Gebildeten, gegen die er wegen ihrer heterodoxen Meinung apologetisch vorgehen würde, sind, bleibt zusätzlich zu untersuchen, ob und in wie weit sich eine eventuelle Anpassung an diese Zielgruppe in der Durchführung der Argumentation niederschlägt.

Nach einer kurzen Einführung zu diesen Homilien und zu deren Erforschung wird deren literarischer Aufbau dargestellt, um sodann die wichtigsten Elemente der theologischen Argumentation zu analysieren.

1. *Die Katechesen des Severus: Einführung und status quaestionis*

Die Katechesen sind ein Teil der Sammlung der *Homiliae cathedrales*, die Severus in den Jahren 512 bis 518, das heißt in der Zeit seines pastoralen Wirkens als Patriarch von Antiochien vor seinem Exil in Ägypten gepredigt und veröffentlicht hat. Die 125 datierten Predigten sind unterschiedlichen Themen gewidmet. Man kann sie in fünf Kategorien untergliedern: Predigten für liturgische Feste, Lobreden auf Heilige, exegetische Homilien, Reden zu besonderen Anlässen und eben die Katechesen, die der unmittelbaren Vorbereitung auf den Taufempfang dienten. Anscheinend war die Zahl der Taufkatechesen Anfang des VI. Jahrhunderts deutlich reduziert. Während Cyrill von Jerusalem im vierten Jahrhundert fast zwanzig Homilien hielt, Theodor von Mopsuestia etwa sechzehn und Johannes Chrysostomus noch weniger¹³, hielt Severus die Taufkatechese nur einmal im Jahr, und zwar am Mittwoch in der Karwoche. Da er jedes Jahr eine neue Predigt verfasst hat, besitzen wir insgesamt sechs Katechesen¹⁴. Diese müssen ziemlich lange gedauert haben: Der Text ist etwa zweimal bis dreimal länger im Vergleich zu den anderen Predigten und verlängert

¹² Es wäre durchaus lohnenswert zu untersuchen, in wie weit sich die Inhalte der Katechesen in den zahlreichen, dem Severus zugeschriebenen Hymnen widerspiegeln, zu mindestens so weit die Textlage der Hymnen einen solchen Vergleich zulässt.

¹³ Drei oder fünf; cfr. A. PIÉDAGNEL, „Introduction“, in *Jean Chrysostome, Trois catéchèses baptismales* – ed. A. PIÉDAGNEL, Paris, 1990 (SCh 366), p. 42.

¹⁴ Kat I = *homilia cathedrales* 21 – edd. M. BRIÈRE – F. GRAFFIN, Turnhout, 1975 (PO 37), pp. 64-87; Kat II = *hom.* 42 – edd. M. BRIÈRE – F. GRAFFIN, Turnhout, 1971 (PO 36), pp. 30-73; Kat III = *hom.* 70 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1915 (PO 12), pp. 5-51; Kat IV = *hom.* 90 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1932 (PO 23), pp. 120-165; Kat V = *hom.* 109 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1943 (PO 25), pp. 732-781; Kat VI = *hom.* 123 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1960 (PO 29), pp. 124-189.

sich jedes Jahr. Im Gefolge der Verurteilung des Severus durch Kaiser Justinian im Jahre 536 ist der griechische Originaltext leider verlorengegangen, obwohl griechische Fragmente der Werke des Severus in den Katenenkommentaren unter Pseudonymen wieder auftauchen. Glücklicherweise sind die syrischen Übersetzungen gut erhalten. Die erste Übertragung seiner Werke ins Syrische stammt von Paulus von Callinicus, einem Freund des Severus, und wurde schon zu dessen Lebenszeit veröffentlicht. Eine zweite revidierte Übersetzung verdanken wir dem gelehrten Jakobus von Edessa, der Anfang des achten Jahrhunderts die Version des Paulus mit dem Ziel überarbeitet hat, den syrischen Text dem griechischen Original anzunähern. Die moderne kritische Edition¹⁵ gibt diese zweite Version wieder. Die erste wird nur gelegentlich verwendet, um eventuelle Lücken zu füllen. Insgesamt, dank den philologischen Besonderheiten der Übersetzung, ist nicht nur die Ausführung der theologischen Argumentation fast problemlos rekonstruierbar, sondern selbst die griechischen *termini technici* sind sehr gut erkennbar.

Trotz ihrer Bedeutung sind die Katechesen des Severus bis heute unzureichend untersucht worden. 1960 veröffentlichte F. Graffin¹⁶, Direktor der *Patrologia Orientalis* und selbst Editor des Severus, einen Artikel über die Katechesen des Severus, in dem er versuchte, die Aufmerksamkeit der Theologen und der Historiker auf diese Homilien zu lenken. Obwohl die Katechesen damals noch nicht vollständig ediert waren, konnte Graffin, der Zugang zu den Handschriften hatte, erste Informationen über Plan, Inhalt und Zuhörer liefern. Besonders fasziniert zeigt er sich von der katechetischen Methode des Severus, die er so beschreibt:

Wir haben hier den Schlüssel zur Lehrmethode des Severus: von einem Bibelzitat starten, es wortwörtlich analysieren, es an seine Erklärung des Glaubensbekenntnisses aufhängen und gleichzeitig, um die Klippe einer trockenen und abstrakten Erklärung zu umschiffen, die Zuhörer vor eine der großen Theophanien des Alten oder des Neuen Testaments versetzen, oder besser, diese Szene so beschreiben, dass alle sich als anwesend und beteiligt fühlen¹⁷.

Graffin ist kaum in der Lage, seine Begeisterung für die Homilien des Severus zu verbergen, die eine traditionelle und auf der Bibel fundierten Methode aufweisen¹⁸. Die Frage nach dem Zusammenhang der unterschiedlichen Elemente blieb aber weiter offen.

¹⁵ Cfr. M. BRIÈRE, "Introduction générale à toutes les homélies", in *Patrologia Orientalis* 29, Paris, 1960, pp. 3-72. Alle Zitate sind eigene Übersetzungen.

¹⁶ F. GRAFFIN, "La catéchèse de Sévère d'Antioche", *L'orient syrien* 5 (1960), pp. 47-54.

¹⁷ Ibid. p. 52.

¹⁸ Ibid. p. 54.

Etwa fünfzehn Jahre später veröffentlichte ein Schüler Graffins, J. Gribomont, einen zweiten Artikel über die Katechesen¹⁹, mit dem Ziel, den Text des von Severus verwendeten Glaubensbekenntnisses zu rekonstruieren. In diesem Sinne sammelte und analysierte er, nach einer detaillierten Zusammenfassung des Inhaltes jeder Predigt, alle Erwähnungen des Credo und verglich die Version des Jakobus von Edessa mit der des Paulus von Callinicus. Das Ergebnis mag wohl unerwartet sein:

Die Katechesen scheinen an keinen besonderen Text gebunden zu sein, die ziemlich freien Zitate variieren von Jahr zu Jahr.²⁰ [...] Nur eines ist sicher: Severus machte den reinen nizänischen Text nicht mit jener Exklusivität erforderlich, die Cyrill von Alexandrien bezeichnet hatte. Zudem wissen wir, dass er, schon vor seinem Episkopat, dem Henotikon folgend, die dogmatische Autorität von Nizäa und Konstantinopel anerkannte, indem er den zweiten Text als eine legitime Erläuterung des ersten betrachtete, im Gegensatz zu Chalcedon, das dessen Verzerrung war²¹.

Obwohl der Sinn der dogmatischen Aussagen des Severus eindeutig ist, sind die Merkmale seiner „*mens theologica*“ eigentlich noch nicht genügend erhellt worden. Am Ende seines Artikels kommt Gribomont zu dem Schluss, dass Severus' persönliche Art, dogmatisch zu denken, uns entgeht. Er kritisiert die Schlussfolgerungen von Graffin bezüglich der theologischen Methode des Severus. Nicht die Bibel sei der Kern der katechetischen Verkündigung, sondern das Glaubensbekenntnis, dessen Struktur die Auswahl der biblischen Zitate bestimme. Gribomont würdigt Severus' umfassende theologische Bildung und seine Hochachtung für die patristische Tradition²², muss aber gleichzeitig feststellen, dass er den Konzilien als solchen keine besondere Autorität anzuerkennen scheint²³.

Seine Methoden in den Kontroversen und die patristischen Quellen seiner Aussagen werden eines Tages ermöglichen, seine Prinzipien, das Verhältnis seines Glaubens zur Schrift, deutlicher zu erläutern. Sollte eine ökumenische Theologie vorhaben, eine Synthese zu entwerfen, die in der Lage sei, Raum zu schaffen für die Traditionen der monophysitischen Kirchen Ägyptens und Syriens, wäre ein Fortschritt in dieser Richtung wahrscheinlich wichtiger als eine feinsinnige Klarstellung seiner christologischen Meinungen. Der Unterricht, den er seinen Katechumenen erteilte, obwohl für Anfänger, besitzt auf jeden Fall einen exemplarischen Charakter und könnte vielleicht

¹⁹ J. GRIBOMONT, "La catéchèse de Sévère d'Antioche et le Credo", *Parole de l'Orient* 6-7 (1975-76), pp. 125-158.

²⁰ Ibid. p. 149.

²¹ Ibid. p. 150.

²² Ibid. p. 156.

²³ Ibid. p. 157.

dazu dienen, das Kräftespiel erkennen zu lassen, das auf der Ebene der dogmatischen Formulierungen eine so wichtige und letztendlich so verhängnisvolle Rolle gespielt hat²⁴.

Gribomont zeigt sich im Grunde wesentlich pessimistischer als Graf fin bezüglich der severianischen Theologie, die er im Grunde genommen beschuldigt, unfähig gewesen zu sein, das Prinzip der lehramtlichen Autorität anzuerkennen und überhaupt andere theologische Traditionen (sprich: Chalcedon) zu respektieren²⁵.

Hier scheint die Forschung über die theologische Argumentation in diesen Katechesen bis heute zum Stillstand gekommen zu sein. Die Katechesen des Severus zeigen selbstverständlich die Spuren seiner theologischen Denkweise, aber um letztere wirklich erfassen zu können, muss man sich systematisch auf sein gesamtes Werk stützen. Nur so wird es möglich, die eventuellen Besonderheiten seines theologischen Diskurses im katechetischen Kontext hervorzuheben.

2. *Der literarische Aufbau der Katechesen*

Am Anfang der II. und der III. Katechese scheint Severus ein gewisses Unbehagen zu befallen, weil er vom Thema her gezwungen ist, sich zu wiederholen; er merkt aber gleichzeitig, dass einige Zuhörer sich vor einer solchen Perspektive unverschämt gelangweilt zeigten²⁶, denn an diesen Veranstaltungen nahmen nicht nur die Katechumenen teil. Um Aufmerksamkeit zu erregen, versucht Severus, die Bedeutung des Wiederholens²⁷ im Unterricht anhand einer etymologischen Untersuchung des Wortes *κατήχησις* zu erklären. *Κατηχέω* bedeutet eben, ein Echo, eine Resonanz hervorbringen. Dies erklärt, warum die Katechesen immer den gleichen dreiteiligen Aufbau haben.

Der erste Teil der Katechese ist in der Tat eine Einladung zur Kontemplation. Sie geschieht in der I., IV., V. und VI. Katechese durch die Erzählung einer biblischen Theophanie, und zwar in der Reihenfolge: der Aufstieg des Mose auf den Berg Sinai, die Engelscharen in Jesaja und Ezechiel,

²⁴ Ibid. pp. 157-158.

²⁵ Ibid. p. 158.

²⁶ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 30-33; III, pp. 5-10.

²⁷ Im liturgischen Kalender kehren die gleichen Feste jedes Jahr zurück. In seinen liturgischen Predigten versucht Severus offensichtlich, Wiederholungen zu vermeiden, indem er das jeweilige Thema von unterschiedlichen Standpunkten betrachtet. Das war wohl auch in der Perspektive der Veröffentlichungen gedacht. Aber normalerweise finden wir in den *Homiliae cathedrales* nur eine bis drei Predigten zu einem Fest, und nicht die ganze Reihe für die sechs Jahre.

Mose vor dem Dornbusch und die Verklärung Jesu. In der II. Katechese zeigt eine symbolische Exegese hinsichtlich der Bekleidung des Mose und der Hohenpriester die Notwendigkeit, sich für die Begegnung mit dem Heiligen vorzubereiten. In der III. Katechese führt die Überlegung über die Etymologie des Wortes *κατηχέω* vom „Echo“ über „Resonanz“ zum „Singen“ und „Lobsingen“ für die Schönheit der Schöpfung und dann von dieser physischen Kontemplation der sichtbaren Welt zur noetischen Kontemplation der unsichtbaren Welt. Der letzte Teil jeder Katechese enthält eine kurze Beschreibung und Erklärung des Taufritus mit einer Ermahnung zur Bekehrung.

Für unsere Zwecke ist aber der zentrale Teil der Katechesen am wichtigsten. Hier erklärt Severus das Wesen des Christentums. Er behandelt grundsätzlich nur zwei Punkte: die Trinitäts- und die Inkarnationslehre. In der I. und II. Katechese folgt die Argumentation der dreiteiligen Struktur des Glaubensbekenntnisses. Die III. Katechese zeigt eine *quaestiones-et-responsiones* -Struktur auf. Ein fiktiver Zuhörer stellt Severus etwa 12 Fragen, die dieser anschließend beantwortet. Die erste Frage lautet zum Beispiel: „Wie kannst du mir befehlen, an den einen Gott zu glauben, wenn du mir dann sagst, auch an seinen einzigen Sohn zu glauben?“²⁸; und die fünfte: „Wie unterscheidet sich die Zeugung (des Sohnes) vom Hervorgehen (des Heiligen Geistes)?“²⁹. In den letzten drei Katechesen wird der dogmatische Unterricht anhand einer Exegese der Theophanieerzählungen entwickelt. In der IV. Katechese führt das von den himmlischen Heerscharen gesungene „*Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus*“ in das trinitarische Mysterium ein, während die in Jesajas' Vision erwähnte glühende Kohle³⁰ als Ausgangspunkt dient, um die Inkarnationslehre zu entfalten. In der V. Katechese meditiert Severus über die Erscheinung am Dornbusch. Gott nennt sich „den Gott Abrahams, den Gott Isaaks und den Gott Jakobs“³¹. Diese Selbstvorstellung Gottes ist als Einführung in die Trinitätslehre zu verstehen, während der Dornbusch, der brennt aber doch nicht verbrennt³², den Wendepunkt zur Inkarnationslehre darstellt. In der letzten Katechese wird die Szene der Verklärung Jesu verwendet, um das Wesentliche der Dogmen zusammenzufassen. Die VI. Katechese enthält zusätzlich eine ausführliche Widerlegung des Manichäismus³³.

²⁸ Kat III, p. 10.

²⁹ Kat III, p. 17.

³⁰ Is 6,6.

³¹ Ex 3,15-16.

³² Ex 3,2.

³³ Kat VI, pp. 148-184.

3. *Elemente der theologischen Argumentation*

Um die theologische Denkweise des Severus besser zu beleuchten, sollen jetzt fünf verschiedene Aspekte näher betrachtet werden, und zwar die Theophanien, die *regula fidei*, die biblischen Zitate, der Verweis auf patristische Belegstellen und die Widerlegung der Irrlehren. Während der Umgang mit den *loci theologici* (*regula fidei*, Bibel, Lehrmeinungen der Kirchenväter) und die Bekämpfung häretischer Positionen die Bestandteile jeder theologischen Argumentation in der Spätantike bilden, ist die Darstellung und die Interpretation der Theophanien am Anfang der Katechesen eine severianische Besonderheit.

a. *Die Bedeutung der Theophanien*

Wie schon erwähnt worden ist, fügt Severus gerne die Darstellung der dogmatischen Lehre in den literarischen Rahmen einer biblischen Theophanie ein. Es geht hier nicht nur um ein rhetorisches Mittel, um das Interesse des Publikums zu wecken oder das Memorieren schwieriger abstrakter Begriffe durch visuelle Assoziationen zu erleichtern. Viel mehr spiegelt die Verwendung dieser Texte das severianische Verständnis von „θεωρία“ wider, in der es um die konkreten Wege geht, die den Menschen zu einer intellektuellen Begegnung mit dem Göttlichen führen³⁴. Severus' Überle-

³⁴ Neben der hier gezeichneten fundamentalen Bedeutung des Begriffes *θεωρία*, so wie er in den *Homiliae cathedrales* des Severus zu lesen ist, finden wir auch in den polemischen Schriften den Begriff *ἐν θεωρίᾳ*, der mit diesem zwar wortwörtlich übereinstimmt, aber im theologischen Diskurs des Severus das Gegenteil bedeutet. Das Wort *θεωρία* kann sowohl das intellektuelle Sehen oder das Erkennen eines Gegenstandes bedeuten, als auch das Ergebnis des Erkenntnis, das sich im Geist des Erkennenden befindet. Im ersten Fall erkennt der Erkennende den Gegenstand seiner Betrachtung, er hat also einen direkten Zugang zum Objekt und seine Kenntnis ist objektiv. Wenn der Gegenstand göttlich ist, ist das Wort am besten mit Kontemplation zu übersetzen. Im zweiten Fall bleibt der Erkennende seinen eigenen Gedanken verhaftet. Was er erkennt, sind seine eigenen theoretischen Überlegungen (Theorien), die aber der Wirklichkeit nicht notwendigerweise entsprechen. In den *Homiliae cathedrales* des Severus findet den Begriff *θεωρία* im ersten Sinne verwendet (Cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 29-39 mit den Hinweisen auf die verschiedenen Belegstellen), und dieser hängt grundlegend mit der Vorstellung des Severus über die Wege der göttlichen Offenbarung zusammen. Die zweite Bedeutung wird um den von Cyrill unterschriebenen Ausdrucks „zwei Naturen“ in Christus im miaphysitischen Sinne umzudeuten verwendet. Nach der Union kann man von zwei Naturen in Christus reden aber nur *ἐν θεωρίᾳ* (theoretisch), in Wirklichkeit gibt es nur die eine göttliche Natur, die Mensch geworden ist. Severus übernimmt diese Erklärung vom späten Cyrill und verwendet sie in seinen Streitschriften (cfr. J. LEBON, *Le monophysisme sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique sur la résistance monophysite au concile de Chalcédoine jusqu'à la constitution de l'Église Jacobite*, Lovanii, 1909, pp. 345-369 für das gesamte Dossier. In den Katechetischen Homilien spielt diese zweite Bedeutung keine Rolle.

gungen betreffen insbesondere das Verhältnis zwischen der Selbstitteilung Gottes in der Heilsgeschichte, die durch Mose, die Propheten, die Apostel und durch Jesus Christus selbst stattgefunden hat, und den Privatoffenbarungen oder mystischen Phänomenen, die ihm, besonders während der monastischen Phase seines Lebens, wohl bekannt waren³⁵. Grob gesagt gibt es für Severus drei Möglichkeiten, zur Kontemplation, „θεωρία“, des Göttlichen zu gelangen. Direkte Erfahrungen oder Begegnungen, die so genannten mystischen Phänomene wie die der Propheten oder großen Heiligen sind bei weitem die stärksten und berühren am meisten. Diese verändern die Menschen, denen sie zuteil werden, und sind per se jedem Menschen möglich. Aber wie Severus in der 108. Hom. zum Hld 5,2-3 deutlich sagt³⁶, stehen solche Privatoffenbarungen in der Gefahr, teuflische Täuschungen zu sein. In der jetzigen Lage der Menschheit bringen diese Erfahrungen keinen sicheren Herkunftsbeweis. Nur dann können sie als von der Gnade verursacht betrachtet werden, wenn sie mit den geoffenbarten Dogmen übereinstimmen. Severus ist offensichtlich einer charismatischen Religiosität gegenüber skeptisch. Die zweite Quelle der göttlichen „θεωρία“ ist das Studium der Heiligen Schrift. Die Begeisterung, die die Meditation der Bibel auslösen kann, kann natürlich mit mystischen Entzückungen nicht verglichen werden. Es geht hier mehr um eine ruhige, gemäßigte, aber dafür dauerhafte Freude, die sichere Ergebnisse in der Gotteserkenntnis bringt³⁷. Natürlich geschieht die Interpretation der Schrift auch nicht ohne Schwierigkeiten, und Fehler sind in diesem Bereich immer möglich, wie das Auftreten zahlreicher Häresien zeigt. Die dritte Quelle der „θεωρία“ sind die Dogmen des Glaubens, die die Trinitäts- und die Inkarnationslehre festlegen. Sie bieten eine objektive und sichere Kenntnis der innergöttlichen Realität, die sogar die (über-)natürlichen Kenntnisse der Engel übertrifft³⁸. Paradoxerweise bleiben aber die Dogmen auf einer rein theoretischen Ebene. Sie sind nicht in der Lage, den Willen zu motivieren, die Leidenschaften zu erregen oder die Gefühle zu bewegen. Selbst vor der Vernunft müssen sie verteidigt werden. Sie dienen als „Lackmuspapier“, als Nachweis der Orthodoxie, der dem Leser zum richtigen Verständnis der Heiligen Schrift verhilft und die Echtheit geistlicher Erfahrungen bestätigt. Wenn Severus die Erläuterung des trinitarischen und christologischen Dogmas in einen Theophaniebericht einrahmt, will er damit unterstreichen, dass das Dogma eine göttliche Herkunft hat, dass

³⁵ Über Severus' *θεωρία*-Begriff, cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 29-39.

³⁶ *Hom.* 108 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1943 (*PO* 25,4), pp. 700-717; cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 59-64.

³⁷ Cfr. *Hom.* 96 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1935 (*PO* 25,1), pp. 97-98.

³⁸ Cfr. *Kat* IV, p. 130.

es den unüberbietbaren Gipfel der menschlichen Gotteserkenntnis zeigt und dass es infolgedessen als Probe dient, um die Wahrheit vom Irrtum zu unterscheiden. Gleichzeitig werden durch diese literarische Darstellung die Zuhörer dazu ermutigt, ihr geistiges Leben so zu vertiefen, dass sie an der Realität der Theophanien beteiligt sein können. Die Zuhörer sind schon im Besitz des Dogmas, zumindest dessen sprachlicher und grammatikalischer Formulierung. Sie müssen noch ihre geistigen Sinne durch die Übungen der Kontemplation so reinigen und schärfen, dass sie, fast wie Mose und die Propheten, die Anwesenheit Gottes erfahren können. Angesichts der Bedeutung, die das Lesen der Schrift für Severus hat, kann man die gesamten katechetischen Homilien, in denen die Dogmen durch unzählige Bibelzitate belegt und beleuchtet werden, als eine Art Kontemplationsübung für Anfänger betrachten.

Zum Schluss möchte ich noch auf ein weiteres Element aufmerksam machen. Severus scheint sich mit Mose auf eine Stufe zu stellen, indem er dessen Funktion als Vermittler der Offenbarung übernimmt. Seine besondere Autorität in Glaubensdingen versteht Severus anscheinend nicht nur als Folge seiner Gelehrsamkeit oder seiner persönlichen Heiligkeit, sondern auch als Bestandteil seiner Rolle als Patriarch und Haupt der Bischöfe³⁹, die ihn befähigt, die Tradition der Kirche zu interpretieren und zu verteidigen, im Notfall auch gegen kaiserliche Bestimmungen. Wir finden in den *Homiliae cathedrales* Ansatzpunkte für eine Theorie des kirchlichen Lehramtes, die in der römischen Tradition besonders entwickelt wurde.

b. *Die theologische Bedeutung der regula fidei*

Es soll jetzt versucht werden, die theologische Bedeutung der dogmatischen Formulierungen in Severus' Katechesen näher zu bestimmen. Ihr paradoxer Charakter wurde schon erwähnt: Sie bringen die Kernaussagen der Offenbarung zum normativen Ausdruck, sind aber nicht in der Lage, die menschliche Seele zu bewegen. Darüber hinaus geht Severus trotz der wichtigen Rolle, die er den Dogmen zuweist, merkwürdigerweise mit deren Wortlaut sehr locker um, dies hat Gribomont in seinem diesbezüglichen Artikel gezeigt. Es bleibt auch noch zu klären, wer überhaupt berechtigt ist, Dogmen zu verkünden.

Ein erster Hinweis auf den Sinn der Dogmen kann der III. Katechese entnommen werden. Severus antwortet auf eine Frage hinsichtlich der Legitimität, Wörter und Begriffe im Glaubensbekenntnis zu verwenden, die nicht in der Bibel enthalten sind, in folgender Weise:

³⁹ Cfr. R. ROUX, "Notes sur la fonction épiscopale selon Sévère d'Antioche", in *EYKOΣMIA. Studi miscellanei per il 75° di Vincenzo Poggi S.J.* – ed. V. RUGGIERI – L. PIERALLI, Soveria Mannelli, Catanzaro, 2003, pp. 427-441.

Aber – sagst du –, die Heilige Schrift hat nicht gesagt, dass Er ὁμοούσιος mit uns ist, und ich fürchte mich davor, ein Wort zu sagen, das nicht geschrieben ist. [Severus antwortet:] Ich würde diese deine Furcht loben, wenn das, was du sagst, nicht aus einem schlechten Grund oder aus Unkenntnis käme. Was sagst du mir eigentlich? Gibt es vielleicht im göttlichen Buch die Aussage: der Sohn ist ὁμοούσιος mit dem Vater bezüglich der Gottheit? oder die heilige Jungfrau wird Mutter Gottes genannt? oder das Wort ist fleischgeworden? oder er ist menschengeworden? Nirgendwo in den Wörtern der gottinspirierten Bücher ist es möglich, diese Sätze in diesem genauen Wortlaut zu finden. Dennoch, dank ähnlicher Wörter und unbestreitbarer Formulierungen und Gedanken konnten die Interpreten der Geheimnisse der apostolischen Kirche zu diesen Aussagen kommen. Als sie lernten, dass Gott der Vater durch Mose sagte: Ich bin, der ich bin, und dass Johannes über den Sohn schrieb, am Anfang war der Logos, und, der, der ist, der war, und der kommt, haben sie verstanden und ohne Fehler beurteilt, dass wenn zwei die eine und die gleiche Existenz haben, dann haben sie notwendigerweise auch ein Wesen und ein Sein und haben bestimmt, dass der Sohn ὁμοούσιος mit dem Vater ist. Als sie lasen, der Logos ist Fleisch geworden (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο), haben sie gesagt, dass er fleischgeworden ist (ἐνσαρκώθη). Als sie weiter gehört haben, er hat unter uns gewohnt, und Jesus Christus – Mensch, haben sie offen bekundet, dass er menschengeworden ist. Als sie die göttlichen Offenbarungen in der Prophetie des Jesaja gehört haben, seht, die Jungfrau wird ein Kind empfangen, sie wird einen Sohn gebären, ihr werdet ihm den Namen Emmanuel geben und ein Kind ist uns geboren, ein Sohn wurde uns gegeben. Die Herrschaft liegt auf seiner Schulter; man nennt ihn: (...) Wunderbarer Ratgeber, Starker Gott, haben sie zur Mutter Gottes diejenige erklärt, die das Kind, den starken Gott, geboren hat. Ebenso, als sie gelernt haben, er nimmt sich der Nachkommen Abrahams an⁴⁰ und in allem uns, seinen Brüdern, gleich außer der Sünde und wie die Kinder hat er in gleicher Weise Fleisch und Blut angenommen⁴¹ und wir sind Glieder seines Leibes⁴², von seinem Fleisch und Blut, haben sie gelehrt, dass er nach dem Fleisch ὁμοούσιος mit uns ist. Infolgedessen solltest du entweder auch die anderen Formulierungen ablehnen, weil sie nicht nach deinen Vorstellungen geschrieben sind, oder, wenn du jene annimmst, dann nimm auch diese an, da sie von den gleichen Lehrern stammen oder besser von dem Geist, der durch sie gesprochen hat.⁴³

Der Gebrauch von nicht biblischen Termini ist seit dem Konzil von Nizäa, das das Wort ὁμοούσιος zum ersten Mal offiziell einführte, als problematisch empfunden worden. Die severianische Erläuterung unter-

⁴⁰ Heb 2,16.

⁴¹ Heb 2,14.

⁴² Eph 5,30.

⁴³ Kat III, pp. 42-45.

sucht verschiedene Fachwörter und beweist, dass sie unwiderlegbar auf der Schrift basieren. Im Grunde genommen dienen diese Fachausdrücke als genaue und akribische Zusammenfassungen unterschiedlicher Bibelstellen, und nur in diesem Sinne gewinnen sie ihre Autorität und können für katechetische oder exegetische Zwecke weiterverwendet werden, um zum Beispiel zweifelhafte Stellen zu erhellen. Severus erkennt die Stimme des Heiligen Geistes in den Worten der apostolischen Lehrer, weil und nur wenn sie den Sinn der in der Bibel bezeugten Offenbarung genau und sorgfältig wiedergeben. Ein Konzil kann den Glauben nicht festlegen, sondern der orthodoxe Glaube ist der Nachweis für die Orthodoxie eines Konzils. Es fällt auf, dass bei Severus die Funktion der Glaubensbekenntnisse oder *regulae fidei* innerhalb des theologischen Diskurses, auffällig stark der Funktion der *regulae iuris* im römischen Recht (innerhalb des juristischen Diskurses) ähnelt. Severus hatte eine juristische Ausbildung erhalten und arbeitete eine Zeit lang sogar als Professor für Recht in Beirut, wo sich die wohl bekannteste juristische Fakultät der Antike befand⁴⁴. In dem *mare magnum* der römischen Gesetze, Edikte, Reskripte und Lokalgebräuche dienten die *regulae iuris*, die aber keine Gesetzte waren, als praktische Wegweiser, um das Recht zu interpretieren und Recht zu sprechen⁴⁵. Der berühmte römische Jurist Paulus hat die *regulae iuris* so definiert: „*Regula est quae rem quae est breviter enarrat. Non ex regula jus sumatur, sed ex jure quod est fiat regula.*“⁴⁶ In ähnlicher Weise beschreibt Severus die *regulae fidei*. In der 91. Predigt zum Fest des heiligen Athanasius, lobt Severus die Lehre des alexandrinischen Patriarchen, indem er sagt: „Er hat wahrhaftig in wenigen Worten den Sinn und die Aussagen der von Gott inspirierten Schrift zusammengefasst, die sich sonst an mehreren zerstreuten Stellen befinden.“⁴⁷ Aus dem Gesagten wird ersichtlich: Zum einen die praktische Bedeutung der Glaubensbekenntnisse für Severus, insofern die Genauigkeit und Korrektheit der Formulierung feststeht, zum anderen Severus' lockerer Umgang mit deren Wortlaut, da sie keine Quellen für die Bestimmung der Glaubensinhalte sind, sondern rein praktische Zusammenfassungen darstellen. Ihre Autorität in Glaubenssachen beruht auf ihrer Übereinstimmung mit der biblischen Offenbarung und nicht auf der Autorität der Gremien, Synoden oder Konzile, die sie verkündet haben.

⁴⁴ Cfr. V. POGGI, „Severo di Antiochia alla scuola di Beirut“, in *L'eredità classica nelle lingue orientali*, Roma, 1986, pp. 57-71.

⁴⁵ Cfr. ROUX, „Concept of Orthodoxy“, pp. 487-488.

⁴⁶ *Digestus*, 50,17,1.

⁴⁷ *Hom.* 91 – ed. M. BRIÈRE, Paris, 1935 (*PO* 25), p. 15.

c. *Biblische Zitate*

Die katechetischen Homilien sind ein Gewebe aus Bibelziten. So äußert sich Severus über den Reichtum der Heiligen Schrift, der ihm zu Hilfe kommt, wenn er sich vor den göttlichen Mysterien wie verloren fühlt:

Bist du dann in Not und leidest du unter dem Hunger nach Gotteserkenntnis? Wo doch ein reich gedeckter Tisch (die Heilige Schrift) vor dir bereitet ist, kannst du nicht einfach deine Hand ausstrecken und dich selbst bedienen? Hörst du nicht die heiligen Worte, die dir befehlen: Öffne deine Augen, und iss dich satt an Broten? Denn solche sind die Brote der geistigen Ernährung, die man durch die Kontemplation der Augen des Geistes, wie durch den Mund, verzehrt. Was? Hast du gefragt, und hast du nicht bekommen? Hast du gesucht, und nicht gefunden? Hast du angeklopft, und wurde dir nicht geöffnet? Von all dem hast du entweder nichts getan, oder, wenn du etwas unternommen hast, dann eben nicht, wie es sein sollte. Also, warum bist du noch in Not? Warum bist du in Bedrängnis geraten angesichts von so viel Weite, die dir zur Verfügung steht? Warum bist du arm bei so viel Reichtum? Du brauchst nicht weit zu gehen: das Wort ist neben dir, in deinem Mund und in deinem Herz sagt irgendwo der Heilige Geist.

Mit der Einladung, die Szene des Mose vor dem brennenden Dornbusch zu betrachten, fügt er hinzu:

(...) im Geiste bin ich nach den Mose geoffenbarten Worten gelaufen und, noch bevor ich ihnen begegnet bin oder mein Geist in sie versinken konnte, begegnete ich zuerst dem Licht. Kommt ihr doch zusammen mit mir und seid mit mir erleuchtet und dann machen wir die Offenbarungen voller Theologie⁴⁸ allgemein bekannt.⁴⁹

In diesem Kapitel beschränke ich mich auf drei Aspekte des Umgangs mit der Bibel: die symbolische oder typologische Exegese, die *testimonia* oder die dogmatische Exegese und die Anwendung des hebräischen Originaltextes.

*Die symbolische Exegese*⁵⁰

Mit Freude macht Severus sich auf die Suche nach Entsprechungen und Anknüpfungspunkten zwischen den Ereignissen des Alten und des Neuen

⁴⁸ Wortwörtlich: schwanger von Theologie, das heißt, voll von Erkenntnissen über die Trinitätslehre.

⁴⁹ Kat V, pp. 736-737.

⁵⁰ Mit Absicht vermeide ich hier das Wort „Allegorie“, da Severus selbst Allegorie als Negation der historischen Wahrheit versteht und sich gegen sie wehrt: cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 40-42.

Testaments und zwischen der Bibel und dem alltäglichen Leben. Es ergibt sich eine Art von Exegese, die das Beste der antiochenischen Typologie und einer gemäßigten alexandrinischen Allegorese zu einer Synthese zusammenfasst. In den Ermahnungsreden zur Taufe verwendet er zum Beispiel im typologischen Sinn Ex 15,23-25 (Durchzug durch das Rote Meer)⁵¹ und Ez (LXX) 47,8-9 (wohin der Fluss kommt, dort bleibt alles am Leben)⁵², die Wunderheilung des Naaman durch Elischa (2 Kön 5,10-14)⁵³; oder die rituelle Reinigung von der Lepra (Lev 14,8-32; 13, 57; 14,49-53)⁵⁴. In allen diesen Texten sieht Severus eine Präfiguration der Taufe. Der Schleier, mit dem Mose sich bedeckt, als er vom Berg Sinai hinabsteigt⁵⁵, sowie die Kleider, die die Priester wechseln müssen, wenn sie vom Allerheiligsten herausgehen, um sich zum Volk zu wenden⁵⁶, symbolisieren die Schwierigkeiten, die der Prediger überwinden soll, wenn er versucht, mit einfachen und verständlichen Worten über die göttlichen Geheimnisse zu reden⁵⁷. In ähnlicher Weise werden auch die schon genannten Theophanienerzählungen aktualisiert. Severus' Schilderung der Theophanien ist so lebendig und bezaubernd, dass die Zuhörer (sowie die heutigen Leser) den Eindruck haben, als könnten sie über die raum-zeitlichen Grenzen hinaus gegenwärtig an jenen Offenbarungen teilnehmen.

Die dogmatische Exegese

In Folge der theologischen Kontroversen haben die unterschiedlichen Lager Listen von Bibelzitaten hergestellt, die den einen oder den anderen dogmatischen Standpunkt unterstützen sollten. Solche Sammlungen von *testimonia* haben dann eine besondere Art der Bibelauslegung begründet, die man auf Grund der behandelten Themen als „dogmatische“ bezeichnen kann⁵⁸. Aus ihrem Zusammenhang herausgelöst und in neue Einheiten auf der Basis eines gemeinsamen Themas (die Zeugung des Sohnes, die Gottheit und die Menschheit Christi, das Hervorgehen des Heiligen Geistes etc.) zusammengeführt, gewinnen diese Zitate durch den erweiterten Kontext neue Bedeutungsmöglichkeiten. In den Katechesen des Severus sind mehrere Listen von *testimonia* zu finden. Die Trinitätslehre wird zum

⁵¹ Kat I, pp. 83-87.

⁵² Kat I, *ibid.*

⁵³ Kat II, pp. 63-73.

⁵⁴ Kat III, pp. 162-163.

⁵⁵ Cfr. Ex 34,33-35.

⁵⁶ Cfr. Ez 44,14.19.

⁵⁷ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 32-34.

⁵⁸ Cfr. M. SIMONETTI, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, Edinburgh, 1994, pp. 121-137.

Beispiel in der II. Katechese anhand von 13 Bibelzitaten (Joh 1,1; 1 Kor 1,24; Hebr 1,2-3; Joh 10,38; Joh 14,10-11; Joh 1,18; 1 Joh 1,1; Joh 15,26; Gen 41,16.38; Joh 1,4; Joh 1,27; Mt 11,27; 1 Kor 2,10) erläutert⁵⁹; für die Inkarnationslehre werden nur acht verwendet (Jak 1,17; Hos 12,11; Ez 1,28; Phil 2,7; Phil 2,6; Mt 17,2; Lk 24,39; Hebr 2,14)⁶⁰. In der III. Katechese antwortet Severus auf die Frage über die Beweise der Trinitätslehre im Alten Testament mit dreizehn *testimonia* aus Genesis, Exodus und Psalmen (Gen 1,26.27; 18,2.3.4; 19,2; Ex 33,11.18.21; Ps (LXX) 32,6; 73,13; 82,19; 101,27)⁶¹. Typisch für die dogmatische Exegese ist die Auslegung von Gen 1,26 („lasst uns Menschen machen als unser Abbild“)⁶². Um den Einwand, es gehe hier um einen *pluralis majestatis*, zurückzuweisen, bringt Severus verschiedene *testimonia* (Jes 44,6; Jes 45,7.12; Ps 73,13; Ps 101,26), die beweisen, dass Gott in der Bibel keinen *pluralis majestatis* verwendet, wenn er von sich selbst spricht: Gott im Gegensatz zu den Menschen ist nicht eitel. Wenn er im Plural spricht, ist das also ein Zeichen, dass es in ihm eine Art „Vielzahl“ geben muss: die Trinität. Diese Schlussfolgerung wird durch andere Bibelstellen bestätigt: die drei Besucher, vor denen Abraham sich niederwirft, als seien sie ein einziges Wesen (Gen 18,2-3); Gen 19, 24 (der Herr ließ auf Sodom und Gomorra Schwefel und Feuer regnen, vom Herrn, vom Himmel herab), wo von zwei Herren die Rede ist, während nach Ps 82,19 der Name „Herr“ nur für Gott verwendet sein darf, und nicht für einen Engel. Und noch Ex 33,18, als Mose zu Gott sagt: zeig mir deine Herrlichkeit. Gott war aber schon vor ihm und hatte sich schon gezeigt. Damit meinte Mose, zeig mir den Logos. Die Herrlichkeit Gottes ist ja eine Bezeichnung für den Sohn, wie Joh 14,19 (wer mich sieht, sieht den Vater) und Joh 1,14 (wir haben seine Herrlichkeit gesehen) unwiderlegbar beweisen. In der dogmatischen Exegese werden die Einzelheiten der Grammatik, die Wiederholungen, die einzelnen Wörter unter die Lupe genommen, um Verbindungen zwischen sehr unterschiedlichen Texten herzustellen und neue Bedeutungen zu entdecken.

Anwendung des hebräischen Textes

In den Katechesen finden wir auch einige philologische Anmerkungen über den hebräischen Originaltext und seine Übertragung ins Griechische. Die Bedeutung des Wortes Cherubim (Unmenge des Wissens) wird

⁵⁹ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 35-49.

⁶⁰ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 49-63.

⁶¹ Cfr. Kat III, pp. 21-24.

⁶² Cfr. Kat III, pp. 24-26.

durch eine hebräische Pseudo-Etymologie erklärt⁶³. Die Wortwiederholung in Ps (LXX) 109,1 (So spricht der Herr zu meinem Herrn) wird durch den Originaltext erklärt: Im Hebräischen gibt es mehrere Wörter, wie Jhwh und Adonai oder Elohim, die ins Griechische mit einem einfachen Kyrios übersetzt werden⁶⁴. Severus bewundert besonders die Arbeit der 70 Übersetzer, die er als von Gott inspiriert betrachtet⁶⁵. Ihre göttliche Inspiration zeigt sich durch kleine Details, die einer Prophezeiung ähnlich sind. Severus erwähnt die Verwendung vom männlichen Artikel vor dem Substantiv „βύστος“ (Dornbusch), der normalerweise eher als Femininum gilt. Da aber der brennende Dornbusch auf den fleischgewordenen Logos hinweist, hat die Septuaginta mit Recht die männliche Form bevorzugt. Selbst das hebräische Wort für Passah (πέσχα), das ursprünglich „Überschreitung“ bedeutet, wurde ins Griechische mit πάσχα übertragen. Pascha ist aber mit dem Wort πάσχω, leiden, verwandt, und wird damit fast zur Prophezeiung des Leidens Christi.

d. *Patristische Zitate*

Am Anfang der I. Katechese beteuert Severus, dass er in seiner Lehrtätigkeit „das pastorale Horn der Kirchenväter und der Kirchenlehrer verwenden will“⁶⁶. Damit will er seine Treue zur kirchlichen Tradition zum Ausdruck bringen. Die außerordentliche theologische Ausbildung des Severus ist in jeder Zeile zu spüren, obwohl hier, im Vergleich zu seinen dogmatischen Werken, die Zahl der Zitate aus den Kirchenvätern unverhältnismäßig gering ist. Es sind in den sechs Katechesen nur drei ausdrückliche Zitate zu finden: eines aus Gregor von Nazianz über die Art und Weise der Inkarnation⁶⁷, eines aus Basilius von Cäsarea über das Wirken des Sohnes und den Sohn als „Werk“⁶⁸ und eines aus einem Pseudo-Gregorius über den Heiligen Geist⁶⁹. Die zwei gregorianischen Zitate sind ein zusätzlicher Beweis für das Credo. Das Basiliuszitat dient dazu, das Wortfeld „ἐργον“ – „ἐνεργεια“ – „ἐνεργείω“ zu klären, um so das Wirken des fleischgewordenen Logos im miaphysitischen Sinne besser zu verstehen. Sonst werden die Väter nur im Allgemeinen erwähnt. Severus preist den

⁶³ Cfr. Kat IV, p. 125.

⁶⁴ Cfr. die lange Erklärung in Kat VI, pp. 139-141.

⁶⁵ Cfr. Kat V, pp. 761-763.

⁶⁶ Kat I, p. 67.

⁶⁷ Cfr. Kat IV, p. 151 und Gregorius Nazianzenus, *Epistula 101 ad Cledonium* I,17 – ed. P. Gallay, Paris, 1974 (Sch 208), pp. 42-44.

⁶⁸ Cfr. Kat V, p. 758 und Basilius Magnus, *Adversus Eunomium IV* (PG 29,689). Die Echtheit von *Adversus Eunomium IV-V* ist umstritten, cfr. F. X. Risch, *Pseudo-Basilios. Adversus Eunomium IV-V. Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Leiden, 1992, pp. 3-12.

⁶⁹ Cfr. Kat IV, pp. 142-143.

Glauben der 318 Väter (von Nizäa)⁷⁰ und ihre orthodoxe Lehre, auf die er sich selber stützen kann⁷¹. Es bleibt aber klar, dass die Väter von Nizäa ihre Autorität gewonnen haben, weil sie die Lehre der Schrift genau wiedergegeben haben⁷². Dieser Sachverhalt in den Katechesen kann mit einem ähnlichen Phänomen verglichen werden, das in den exegetischen Predigten beobachtet worden ist⁷³. Severus scheint die Texte der wichtigsten Theologen gut vor Augen zu haben, er verwendet und korrigiert sie bei Bedarf. Die Autoren werden aber nur dann ausdrücklich erwähnt, wenn es tatsächlich erforderlich ist, wie zum Beispiel in einem polemischen Kontext⁷⁴. In den Katechesen, die eher für Anfänger gedacht sind, können natürlich ausgesprochen theologische Auseinandersetzungen keinen geeigneten Platz finden. Dies könnte meines Erachtens das Fehlen von patristischen Zitaten erklären.

e. *Die Irrlehren*

Zur katechetischen Unterweisung gehört selbstverständlich die Widerlegung der Irrlehren der Häretiker und der Andersgläubigen⁷⁵. An der Spitze der befeindeten Heterodoxen steht Arius, seine Lehre und seine Anhänger⁷⁶. Fast 200 Jahre nach dem Ausbruch der arianischen Krise mag wohl erstaunlich sein, dass der Arianismus für Severus noch so aktuell war. Im Allgemeinen dienten aber die Argumente in der Auseinandersetzung mit den Arianern auch der Gegenrede denjenigen gegenüber, die die Gottheit Christi nicht anerkennen wollten, wie die Juden⁷⁷ (und wir wissen, dass es zwischen den Zuhörern der Katechesen auch einige Konvertiten aus dem Judentum und aus der Sondergruppe der Samaritaner gab⁷⁸) oder gegen diejenigen, die die orthodoxe Trinitätslehre ablehnten, sowohl im Namen eines strengen Monotheismus, wie Sabellius⁷⁹, oder aufgrund ihrer polytheistischen Vorstellungen, wie die Heiden⁸⁰. Die Inkarnationslehre bildet die

⁷⁰ Cfr. Kat VI, p. 145.

⁷¹ Cfr. Kat II, p. 35; Kat V, p. 770.

⁷² Cfr. Kat II, p. 35; III, pp. 42-44; V, p. 767; VI, p. 145.

⁷³ Cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, p. 213.

⁷⁴ Cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 112-117.

⁷⁵ Cfr. zum Beispiel die drei „Anathematismen“ in Kat V, pp. 770-771, die eine Zusammenfassung der dogmatischen Irrtümer darlegen.

⁷⁶ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 37-41; III, pp. 10.19.35-35; IV, pp. 135-140.146; V, pp. 744-745.748.757 (hier wird auch Eunomius erwähnt); VI, pp. 135-139.

⁷⁷ Cfr. Kat III, pp. 19.29; IV, p. 140; V, pp. 748.753; VI, p. 139.

⁷⁸ Cfr. Kat III, p. 29.

⁷⁹ Cfr. Kat II, pp. 41-42; III, p. 19; V, p. 748.

⁸⁰ Cfr. Kat I, p. 67; III, p. 19; IV, p. 131 (die Heiden nennen Zeus „Vater“, aber nicht im christlichen Sinne); V, p. 753.

zweite große Sorge. Severus bekämpft den Apollinarismus⁸¹, Eutyches⁸², aber vor allem die diphysitische Doktrin⁸³. Nestorius wird öfters erwähnt⁸⁴, das Konzil von Chalcedon anscheinend nicht, letzteres geschieht vielleicht aus religionspolitischen Gründen. Anders als in seinen theologischen Abhandlungen geht es in seinen Katechesen nicht um die richtige Interpretation der Lehre Cyrills und der gesamten kirchlichen Tradition, sondern um eine allgemeine Ablehnung des radikalen Dualismus in Christus. Die ganze christologische Kontroverse wird hier auf ihren Kern reduziert: Im Grunde sieht Severus im diphysitischen Verständnis von der göttlichen „ἀπαθεία“ (diese will eben durch die Zwei-Naturen-Lehre in Christus jede Berührung zwischen Gottheit und Leiden vermeiden) einen unnötigen und hochmütigen Versuch, die göttliche Offenbarung im Namen eines menschlichen Begriffs zu bereinigen und zu verbessern⁸⁵. Abergläubische Bräuche werden auch gebrandmarkt⁸⁶, aber Severus zeigt sich vor einer anderen Gefahr beunruhigt, dem Manichäismus⁸⁷. Dieser konkurrierenden Religion widmet Severus in der VI. Katechese eine lange und regelrechte Abhandlung⁸⁸. Die Lehre Manis wird durch umfangreiche Exzerpte aus seinen Schriften dargestellt und widerlegt. Interessanterweise gegen den Versuch seitens der Manichäer, ihren „ὕλη“-Begriff auf die platonische Philosophie zurückzuführen, fügt Severus ein Zitat aus Platon ein, das den Unterschied zwischen den beiden Materiebegriffen deutlich macht⁸⁹.

Summary

This concise presentation of the essential characteristics of the theological argument in the catechetical homilies of Severus has shown how it departs from the central statements of the Creed, in order to expound Christian doctrine in all its splendour through a multitude of biblical texts, in a kind of spiritual meditation. In comparison with Severus' dogmatic works, the argument in the homilies shows differences in substance as well as in methodology. As regards content,

⁸¹ Cfr. Kat II, p. 49; V, p. 765.

⁸² Cfr. Kat IV, p. 155; V, p. 764.

⁸³ Cfr. Kat I, pp. 79-81; II, p. 61; III, pp. 37-39; IV, p. 151; V, pp. 759-768; VI, p. 145.

⁸⁴ Cfr. Kat I, pp. 79-81; IV, p. 151; V, p. 768; VI, p. 145.

⁸⁵ Cfr. *Hom.* 22 – edd. M. BRIÈRE – F. GRAFFIN, Turnhout, 1975 (*PO* 37), p. 96; cfr. ROUX, *L'exégèse biblique*, pp. 195-196.

⁸⁶ Cfr. Kat V, p. 774.

⁸⁷ Cfr. Kat I, pp. 69-71; IV, p. 155; V, p. 764.

⁸⁸ Cfr. Kat VI, pp. 149-185.

⁸⁹ Cfr. Kat VI, pp. 177-179.

other priorities are set. Whereas the dogmatic works are completely taken up with the Christological question, in the homilies a similar urgency is found in the treatment of diverse themes, such as the old yet ever present Arian question of the divine identity of Christ, and the visibly growing phenomenon of Manichaeism. Methodologically, at least regarding Christology, with which a comparison is possible, the entire patristic system seems to disappear. Whereas in the dogmatic writings, the interpretation of the writings of the Church Fathers, in particular those of Cyril, is at the heart of the discussion, the homilies simplify Christology by limiting it to fundamental biblical pronouncements.

Diese knappe Darstellung der Wesenszüge der theologischen Argumentation in den Katechesen des Severus hat gezeigt, wie sie von den Kernaussagen des Credo ihren Ausgang nimmt, um dann durch unzählige biblische Texte die christliche Lehre in ihrem Glanz zu entfalten, in einer Art geistiger Meditation. Im Vergleich zu seinen dogmatischen Werken beweist die Argumentation in den Katechesen sowohl inhaltliche als auch methodologische Unterschiede. Inhaltlich werden andere Schwerpunkte gesetzt. Während in den dogmatischen Werken die christologische Frage die ganze Aufmerksamkeit in Anspruch nimmt, tauchen in den Katechesen andere Themen mit gleicher Dringlichkeit auf, und zwar die alte aber immer aktuelle arianische Frage nach der göttlichen Identität Christi und das offensichtlich sich verbreitende Phänomen des Manichäismus. Methodologisch, zu mindestens im Hinblick auf die Christologie, bei der ein Vergleich überhaupt möglich ist, scheint der gesamte patristische Apparat zu verschwinden. Während in den dogmatischen Schriften die Interpretation der kirchenväterlichen Schriften, besonders des Cyrill, im Mittelpunkt der Diskussion steht, wird die Christologie in den Katechesen vereinfacht und auf die biblischen Grundaussagen begrenzt. Von den vielen Fragen, die noch offen bleiben, möchte ich zum Schluss noch betonen, wie wichtig eine systematische Untersuchung der Rezeption der Kirchenväter bei Severus für ein besseres Verständnis der kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlichen Entwicklungen des sechsten Jahrhunderts wäre, und zwar nicht nur anhand der diesbezüglichen Erforschung seiner Predigten, sondern vielmehr seines ganzen dogmatischen Werkes.

Unidentifizierte karolingische Sedulius-Glossen

Rainer JAKOBI

(Halle a. S.)

Die mittelalterlichen Glossen zu Klassiker- oder patristischen Texten des Schulkanons sind in der Regel interlinear in den Texten selbst überliefert. Aus den Textglossen aber wurden – auch vom Text selbst gelöst – eigenständige Glossare in alphabetischer oder nicht alphabetischer Folge erstellt, die allenfalls noch durch einen Titulus wie *Glossae in Terentium* auf ihre Entstehung und ursprüngliche Funktion verweisen. Vollends unkenntlich wurde die Herkunft aber, wenn mehrere solcher Autorenglossare in einem anonymisierten Lexikon zusammengeführt wurden. Ein moderner Herausgeber und Interpret eines solchen Lexikons steht somit vor der Aufgabe, vor allem über die Quellenanalyse dessen Entstehungszeit und Funktion zu klären. Dies soll im Folgenden für ein vor einigen Jahren ediertes Glossar geleistet werden, dessen zahlreiche Glossen zu Sedulius, einem in karolingischer Zeit beliebten Schulautor, noch nicht als solche erkannt wurden.

Das in Rede stehende, von Paolo Gatti erstmals komplett edierte Glossar, das in der Handschrift Bern, Burgerbibl. A. 91 (18) überliefert ist¹, besteht aus zwei Teilen, deren erster im neunten Jahrhundert entstanden ist und u.a. zwei längere Glossenreihen aus der Fulgentius-Schrift *Expositio sermonum antiquorum* bietet². Auch in die von einer jüngeren Hand im zehnten Jahrhundert zusammengestellte Glossenreihe des zweiten Teils hat eine noch rekonstruierbare lexikalische Quelle Eingang gefunden. Denn die Folge II 95-113 bei Gatti repräsentiert ein karolingisches Glossar zu dem Brief des Sedulius an Macedonium, dem Widmungsbrief zu dem *Paschale Carmen*:

II	95 <i>Venerabilis:</i>	<i>veneratione dignus</i>
	96 <i>Pater:</i>	<i>vocativus</i>
	97 <i>Censeas:</i>	<i>iudices</i>
	98 <i>Severitas:</i>	<i>crudelitas</i>
	99 <i>Ut pote:</i>	<i>tamquam, quasi, ut libet</i>
	100 <i>Suffultus:</i>	<i>instructus, munitus</i>

¹ P. GATTI (ed.), *Un glossario bernense* (Bern, Burgerbibliothek, A. 91 [18]). *Edizione e commento*, Trento, 2001 (Labirinti 55); Auszüge hatte G. LOEWE, *Prodromus corporis glossariorum Latinorum*, Lipsiae, 1876, pp. 158-161 geboten. Vgl. auch G. GOETZ, *De glossariorum Latinorum origine et fatis*, Lipsiae, 1923 (CGL 1), pp. 294-295.

² Vgl. R. JAKOBI, "Zum 'Berner Glossar'", *Philologus*, 153 (2009), pp. 187-189.

101 <i>Immensum:</i>	<i>magnum</i>
102 <i>Formidandum:</i>	<i>timendum</i>
103 <i>Tiro:</i>	<i>iuvenis indoctus</i>
104 <i>Lintrus:</i>	<i>parva navis</i>
105 <i>Naufragium:</i>	<i>periculum</i>
106 <i>Sollertia:</i>	<i>industria, acumen</i>
107 <i>Tandem:</i>	<i>aliquando</i>
108 <i>Fatius:</i>	<i>stultus</i>
109 <i>Sentes:</i>	<i>spinę</i>
110 <i>Sarcina:</i>	<i>onus</i>
111 <i>Moles:</i>	<i>magnitudo</i>
112 <i>Nitor:</i>	<i>volo, cupio</i>
113 <i>Nefas:</i>	<i>illicitum</i>

Man vergleiche den Brief selbst (CSEL 10, pp. 1,2-4,5):

priusquam me, venerabilis pater, operis nostri decurso volumine censeas et rite forsán severitatis obiurges, utpote qui nulla veteris scientiae praerogativa suffultus tam immensum paschalis pelagus maiestatis et viris quoque peritissimis formidandum parva tiro lintre cucurrerim: huius apud te facti causas expurgem, ut cum me non audacem fuisse probaveris sed devotum, in pectoris tui portum blanda tranquillitate recipias, quem gubernante Deo laetaberis nulla pertulisse naufragia. cum saecularibus igitur studiis occupatus vim inpatientis ingenii, quod divinitatis in me providentia generavit, non utilitati animae sed inani vitae dependerem, et litterariae sollertia disciplinae lusibus infructuosi operis, non auctori serviret: tandem misericors Deus, rerum conditor, clementius fabricam sui iuris aspexit et stultos in me mundanae sapientiae diutius haberi sensus indoluit ac fatuum prudentiae mortalis ingenium caelesti sale condivit. moxque ut cordis oculus interior caligo deseruit, per sentes dumosi ruris errantia in herbam florei cespitis revolvi vestigia totoque nisu melioris arbitrii cultum inlustrati pectoris Deo dicavi, non praesumptione virium sarcinam tantae molis arripiens ... nefas esse pensabam muti tenacitate silentii cum nullo partiri, ne unius talenti creditam quantitatem dum nitor cautius custodire, culpa defossae pecuniae non carerem.

Die Glossen II 29-41 Gatti gehen auf folgende Teile des Macedonius-Briefes zurück:

II 29	<i>Quamquam:</i>	<i>licet, quamvis</i>
30	<i>Exor[ci]tationibus:</i>	<i>amonitionibus</i>
31	<i>Expedire:</i>	<i>narrare</i>
32	<i>Stilo:</i>	<i>scriptione, graphio</i>
33	<i>Facundia:</i>	<i>eloquentia</i>
34	<i>Oblectat:</i>	<i>delectat</i>
35	<i>Mellitum:</i>	<i>suave, dulce</i>
36	<i>Iterando:</i>	<i>repetendo, relegendo</i>
37	<i>Egregius:</i>	<i>nobilis</i>
38	<i>Commode:</i>	<i>apte</i>

40 <i>Profusius</i> :	<i>amplius, ardentius</i>
41 <i>Affabilis</i> :	<i>delectabilis, amabilis</i>

Man vergleiche auch hier den Brief selbst:

(p. 3,10) *quamquam ipsi cuncta monstrantes ... (p. 4,9) ut alios exhortationibus veritatis (pp. 5,1-6,13) ... non differam breviter expedire. raro, pater optime, ... divinae munera potestatis stilo quisquam huius modulationis aptavit, et multi sunt quos studiorum saecularium disciplina per poeticas magis delicias et carminum voluptates oblectat. hi quicquid rhetoricae facundiae perlegunt, neglegentius adsequuntur, quoniam illud haud diligunt: quod autem versuum viderint blandimento mellitum, tanta cordis aviditate suscipiunt, ut in alta memoria saepius haec iterando constituent et reponant ... hae sunt, pater egregie, nostri operis causae, non supervacuae, sicut didicisti, sed commoda: ... cur, inquit, adfabilis amice, quem gratia purae dilectionis amplector, dum me profusius niteris venerari prae ceteris et fidi propositi sedulitate sectaris*

Die Reihe II 42-48 Gatti basiert schließlich auf dem Schlußteil des gleichen Briefes:

II 42 <i>Aemulus</i> :	<i>invidens</i>
43 <i>Ambaies</i> :	<i>circumlocutiones</i>
44 <i>Favente</i> :	<i>adiuvante</i>
45 <i>Obsecro</i> :	<i>precor</i>
46 <i>Pro</i> :	<i>ante</i>
47 <i>Logos</i> :	<i>locutio vel sermo</i>
48 <i>Complexus</i> :	<i>comprehendens, constringens</i>

Zu vergleichen ist aus dem Macedonius-Brief:

(pp. 12,1-13,2) *cesset, obsecro, plurimorum iactura verborum; cessent longae deinceps excusationis ambages, nec pigeat post tanti gurgitis emensa discrimina fluctuanti adhuc paginae auctoritatis tuae ancoram commodare. quatuor igitur mirabilium divinorum libellos, quos ex pluribus pauca complexus usque ad passionem et resurrectionem ascensionemque Domini nostri Iesu Christi quatuor evangeliorum dicta congregans ordinavi, contra omnes aemulos tuae defensioni commendo. huic autem operi favente Domino PASCHALIS CARMINIS nomen inposui, quia PASCHA nostrum immolatus est Christus, cui honor et gloria cum Patre et Spiritu sancto per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen. FINIT PROLOGVS SEDVLII*

Nicht nur der in Prosa verfaßte Widmungsbrief, sondern auch die Versdichtung selbst, das *Paschale Opus*, ist durch ähnliche sukzessive Ketten vertreten. Sicher als Sedulius-Glossen können die Glossennummern II 53-62 Gatti gelten:

53 <i>Boatus</i> : sonus	< <i>carm.</i> 1,18 <i>boatu</i>
55 <i>Arida</i> : sicca	< <i>carm.</i> 1,49ff. <i>squalentia iugera campi / et steriles habitare plagas,</i>

56 <i>Humus: terra</i>	<i>ubi gignere fructum / arida nescit <u>humus</u></i>
57 <i>Squalentia: sordida</i>	
58 <i>Magestas: magnitudo</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,35 <u>maiestas</u>
59 <i>Vetiti: prohibiti</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,70 <u>vetiti</u> <i>dulcedine pomi</i>
60 <i>Anguis: diabolus</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 2,1ff. <i>expulerat primigenitum saevissimus <u>anguis</u> /</i>
62 <i>Nectaris: saporis</i>	<i>florigera de sede virum blandique <u>saporis</u> / inlecebris</i> ³

Den Versen *carm.* 1,60-62

*Omnipotens aeterne Deus, spes unica mundi,
qui caeli fabricator ades, qui conditor orbis,
qui mare undisonas fluctu surgente procellas*

gelten die Glossen II 91-94 Gatti:

- 91 *Spes dicitur quasi stabilis [s]pes*⁴
 92 *Procella: vis venti cum pluvia, dicte*⁵ *quasi porro excellentes*
 93 *Distantia est inter aeternum et se<m>piternum: aeternus qui nec cepit nec desinit,
 sempiternus quod quidem cepit et numquam desinit.*
 94 *Omnipotens: qui omnia potest.*

Auch auf das Gedicht des Sedulius gehen schließlich – ohne Anspruch auf Vollständigkeit – die Glossen II 151-157 Gatti zurück:

II	151	<i>Rubus genus spinosi; et dicitur rubus quod fructus eius rubeat; a Grecis morus dicitur.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,128 <i>rubus</i>
	152	<i>Subditur: subicitur.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,85 <i>subditur</i>
	153	<i>Edo tres res significat: edo, es est manduco, et edo, edis: compono, et edo: genero.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,113 <i>edidit</i>
	154	<i>Rude: novum.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,142 <i>rude</i>
	155	<i>Caterva: multitudo.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,148 <i>catervas</i>
	156	<i>Rudenti: rugient<i>.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,161 <i>rudenti</i>
	157	<i>Ablata: sublata.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,154 <i>ablata</i>
		(und außerhalb einer Kette	
	26	<i>Erilis: fortis.</i>	< <i>carm.</i> 1,338 <i>erilis</i>)

Die Interpretamente entsprechen nur selten der bekanntesten karolingischen Sedulius-Erklärung, dem Kommentar des Remigius von Auxerre, der von Huemer in Auszügen in seiner Sedulius-Ausgabe (*CSEL* 10, Vindobonae 1885, pp. 316-356) mitabgedruckt wurde: So etwa im Falle von

- 97 *censeas: iudices*
 ~ Remigius *censeas*] .i. *iudices* (p. 316,12 Huemer).

³ Die Vorlage des Bernensis hat also umgekehrt *saporis: nectaris* geboten.

⁴ So schreibe ich gemäß Cassiod. in *psalm.* 39,5 (*CCL* 97 p. 364,82): *spes enim dicta est quasi stabilis pes*. Zugrunde liegt nur eine triviale Dittographie.

⁵ Sc. *procell(a)e*; in der Vorlage des Bernensis war die pluralische Form gemäß Sedulius als Lemma geführt.

Auch die vollständige Remigius-Fassung, die ich in clm 19456 und clm 22307 überprüft habe, ändert nicht den Befund, daß die von Gatti herausgegebenen Glossen der Berner Handschrift in ihrem Gros nicht unmittelbar auf Remigius zurückgehen⁶. Als Quelle der Berner Sedulius-Glossen ist vielmehr eine glossierte Sedulius-Handschrift anzusetzen, wie sie z.B. mit Antwerpen, Mus. Plantin-Moretus 17.4 (126) (s. IX)⁷ vorliegt. Vgl. etwa für den Macedonius-Brief:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 95 <i>venerabilis</i> : | <i>veneratione dignus</i> ~ Gloss. Antw. ad <i>epist.</i> 1,1 p. 254
Caesar <i>venerabilis</i> : <i>dignus veneratione</i> |
| 97 <i>censeas</i> : | <i>iudices</i> ~ Gloss. Antw. zu Sed. <i>epist.</i> 1,1 p. 254 <i>censeas</i> :
<i>iudices</i> |
| 103 <i>tiro</i> : | <i>iuuenis indoctus</i> ~ Gloss. Antw. p. 254 <i>tiro</i> : <i>iuuenis</i> |

oder im Bereich der Dichtung selbst:

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 60 <i>anguis</i> : | <i>diabolus</i> ~ Gloss. Antw. ad <i>carm.</i> 2,1 p. 256 <i>anguis</i> : <i>diabolus per anguem</i> ⁸ |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Solche Glossen wurden getrennt vom Sedulius-Text in die Form eines Lexikon überführt, wie es etwa in Laon 468 f. 52^r-61^r vorliegt⁹, ohne daß die Glossen jetzt alphabetisch geordnet wären. So spiegelt sich die Folge der Sedulius-Sequenzen weiterhin in der Folge der Glossen.

Um zusammenzufassen: Sedulius-Interpretamente sind nicht nur in Sedulius-Handschriften, sondern auch in anonymisierter Form in den Glossaren aufzuspüren. Die Quellenanalyse anonymer Glossenkette als Erklärungen zu einem Schulautor aber eröffnet nicht nur einen Blick in die Werkstatt der mittelalterlichen Lexikographen, sondern auch in die Schulstube mit ihren Autoren und der Art ihrer Vermittlung.

⁶ Nur 43 *ambaies*: *circumlocutiones* und 109 *sentences*: *spine* habe ich unter den noch nicht edierten Remigiana in clm 19456 f. 2^v bzw. f. 4^v wiedergefunden.

⁷ Vgl. C. CAESAR, "Die Antwerpener Handschrift des Sedulius", *RhM*, 56 (1901), pp. 247-271; dort pp. 254-257. Die Handschrift ist digitalisiert auf der Webseite des Museums Plantin-Moretus einsehbar.

⁸ Die Glossen der Antwerpener Sedulius-Hs. überschneiden sich nur in vergleichsweise wenigen Erklärungen mit dem Berner Glossar. Es liegt stemmatisch betrachtet Quellengemeinschaft, nicht eine unmittelbare Deszendenz vor. Immerhin zeigen die Übereinstimmungen, daß man die Quelle der Berner Sedulius-Glossen nicht in einem Sedulius-Kommentar, sondern in einer adnotierten Sedulius-Hs. zu suchen hat.

⁹ Verwiesen sei auf das von J. J. CONTRENI, *Codex Laudunensis 468. A Ninth-Century Guide to Virgil, Sedulius, and the Liberal Arts*, Turnhout, 1984 (Armarius codicum insignium, vol. III) vorgelegte Faksimile. In der Handschrift aus Laon ist die Herkunft der Glossen noch festgehalten mit Rubriken wie *EX EPISTOLA SEDVLII GLOSSE* (f. 52^r) oder *SEDVLII GLOSSVLÆ DE PRIMO LIBRO* (f. 52^v).

The Herwagen Preacher and his Homiliary

Nathan J. RISTUCCIA

(Chicago)

1. *A Lost Codex*

It is hard to study a manuscript that no longer exists. But the transient also has a certain charm.¹ The historian, like a paleontologist, must hope for a well-preserved skeleton or a footprint pressed into volcanic ash to recreate what once was. The Herwagen Homiliary is an ideal candidate for such reconstruction. The codex of this collection is unlocated, probably destroyed; indeed, no one has seen the manuscript since ca. 1562, when the Flemish humanist Jacobus Pamelius collated it for publication. Yet the manuscript's skeleton is extraordinarily well-preserved, as the twenty-two sermons of this homiliary are widely available both in volume ninety-four of Jacques Paul Migne's *Patrologiae Latinae Cursus Completus* and in Johann Herwagen's original edition.²

Moreover, as scholars have long suspected and this article will prove, most of the sermons in the collection (seventeen of the twenty-two) are the handiwork of a single homilist.³ This clergyman, hereafter "the Herwagen preacher," likely taught in Southern Germany during the third quarter

¹ I would like to express my deep appreciation to Hildegund Müller, Els Rose, Thomas N. Hall, Richard J. Oosterhoff, and John Moscattiello for the advice and assistance they gave me in writing this article.

² *Opera Bedae Venerabilis presbyterii Anglosaxonis*, Basel, 1563, cols. 472-514; Herwagen Homiliary, 1-22 [Pseudo-Bede, *Hom.*, 3.59, 3.85-105], *PL* 94, cols. 422B-423B, 477B-507C; Migne placed these twenty-two homilies in his third book of the Venerable Bede's spurious homilies (*homiliae subditiuae*), following two books of genuine homilies. For Bede's most important works, such as the *Ecclesiastical History*, Migne plagiarized from more recent editions, like John Allen Giles' 1843 edition. The third book of Bede's homilies in Migne, however, is right out of the Herwagen edition. (Giles had condemned these as inauthentic homilies.)

³ These seventeen are nos. 4-20. Jean Leclercq argued, largely on stylistic grounds, that twenty of the Herwagen sermons may have the same author. Leclercq maintained that the first three sermons shared an author, pointing to their classicizing, poetic vocabulary and shambolic organization. The scholar forthrightly admitted that he was less certain about the next seventeen sermons (nos. 4-20). Although he notes the next seventeen are usually brief and have some similar low Latin language, he twice qualifies his conclusion with "maybe" (*peut-être*); J. LECLERCQ, "Le IIIe livre des homélies de Bède le Vénérable", *Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 14 (1947), pp. 212, 217-218.

of the eleventh century, as closer examination of his sermons demonstrates. With the needs of his largely lay congregation in mind, the preacher shunned complex exegesis and focused his sermons instead on penitential exhortation and the legends of the saints. This article will study the preacher and his audience, by first scrutinizing the fragmentary evidence extant about Herwagen's manuscript and then examining the style, sources, and content of the seventeen sermons. In this lost codex, we can unearth the spiritual life of one congregation in the Holy Roman Empire, just before the disruptions of the Gregorian reform.

2. In Herwagen's Printshop

Johann Herwagen the Younger (d. 1563), a Reformed printer in Basel, ascribed the twenty-two homilies of the Herwagen Homiliary to Bede in the seventh book of his eight-volume edition of Bede's complete works.⁴ Although Herwagen produced the most complete collection of Bede's writings until then, the printer is now notorious for attributing texts to Bede on the most tendentious of grounds. Herwagen wanted profit, not scholarship or accuracy. As Michael Gorman has demonstrated in his studies of Herwagen's eight-volume edition, in the interest of increasing sales, Herwagen, Pamelius, and their associates engaged unashamedly in fraudulent practices.⁵ They ignored and altered rubrics, expurgated passages, disregarded section breaks, and lied outright about the Bedan origins of their material.⁶ Nonetheless, despite its flaws, Herwagen's eight-volume edition

⁴ For Herwagen's edition of Bede, see M. GORMAN, "The Canon of Bede's Works and the World of Ps. Bede", *Revue Bénédictine*, 111 (2001), pp. 399-445; M. GORMAN, "Jacobus Pamelius (1536-1587) and a St Victor Manuscript Used for the 1563 Edition of Bede: Paris Lat. 14489", *Scriptorium*, 52 (1998), pp. 321-330; C. BURNETT, *Pseudo-Bede: De Mundi Celestis Terrestrisque Constitutione*, London, 1985, pp. 1-2, 6-7, 10-11.

⁵ Herwagen left Bede's own list of works (in the final chapter of the *Ecclesiastical History*) out of the edition, so as not to hurt sales by suggesting that texts not on Bede's list were inauthentic; GORMAN, "Jacobus Pamelius", pp. 327-329; GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 439-440, 408-411; C. W. JONES, *Beda's Pseudoepigrapha: Scientific Writings Falsely Attributed to Bede*, Oxford, 1939, pp. 14-15; P. JACKSON, "Herwagen's Lost Manuscript of the Collectanea", in *Collectanea Pseudo-Beda* – ed. M. BAYLESS – M. LAPIDGE, Dublin, 1998, pp. 101-120.

⁶ Medieval copyists (even already in the later eighth century) and early editors of Bede (such as Johannes Trithemius) wrongly ascribed some works to Bede. Herwagen and his associates, however, took false attribution to an entirely new level. Herwagen manufactured attributions not found in any manuscripts and ignored manuscript titles that explicitly ascribed texts to an author other than Bede. For instance, Herwagen egregiously assigned to Bede a number of commentaries actually by Isidore of Seville. The manuscript that Herwagen used for these Isidorean works (Paris, B. N., lat. 14489) survives, and it explicitly declares Isidore

circulated widely and was twice reprinted (in 1612 and in 1688, both times in Cologne). Although seventeenth-century scholars like Jean Mabillon were already raising doubts about Herwagen's opus, the pernicious edition remained the main version of Bede's works until the nineteenth century.

To pack their eight tomes, Herwagen and his associates mainly plagiarized works from older editions of Bede. Bede's genuine homilies, for instance, which fill the first 472 columns of the seventh volume, are reprinted from Johann Gymnicus' two-volume edition, produced at Cologne in 1535. Herwagen and company, however, also mined approximately a dozen original manuscripts where they found a number of previously unpublished texts.⁷ To date, only five of these manuscripts have been identified.⁸

The young humanist Jacobus Pamelius edited most of the new works in Herwagen's eight volumes.⁹ In his preface, Herwagen laments that Pamelius had difficulty editing these new texts because the manuscripts he used were old, darkened by age, and written in a difficult script.¹⁰ Judging from the five surviving manuscripts, however, Herwagen exaggerated.¹¹ All five are monastic manuscripts written before 1200 in easy-to-read Carolin-

the author. To quote Gorman, "the picture which emerges ... is not a favorable witness to the scholarship which served printing in Basel in the year 1563. The manuscript offers no evidence that any of these works were composed by Bede ... The principle aim behind all these efforts was to add as many texts and extra pages as possible"; GORMAN, "Jacobus Pamelius", p. 327.

⁷ GORMAN, "Jacobus Pamelius", pp. 322-323; GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 439-440.

⁸ According to Herwagen's preface, his father, also a printer, had arranged, some years before his death in 1558, to have scholars seek out manuscripts of unpublished Bedan works. When Herwagen the Younger took over the print shop, he hired Pamelius, with assistance from others, to complete the manuscript collection and edit the works. The preface is edited and translated in GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 441-443; John Bale, the Marian exile and Bishop of Ossory, probably brought some manuscripts from England and Ireland. Bale was a known book collector, lived in Basel during his exile, and had already falsely attributed texts to Bede in a 1549 work. Other figures who helped gather manuscripts include Johannes Herold, a Basel humanist, and Johann Oporin, another Basel printer.

⁹ Pamelius was only twenty-seven and recently ordained as a priest. He spent less than a year working for Herwagen. Later in life, Pamelius became a noted theologian and editor (producing, for instance, editions of texts by authors like Hrabanus Maurus, Cassiodorus, Cyprian, and Tertullian). Although Herwagen was Swiss Reformed, he marketed his edition of Bede to both Catholics and Protestants alike and dedicated it to Marquand von Hattstein, the Catholic bishop of Speyer.

¹⁰ Herwagen asserts that the codices were: *uetusta, obscura, lectu difficilia, interdum etiam deprauata, peruerseque scripta, uix ut oculatissimis et peritissimis legi possint*; GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 441-443; JACKSON, "Herwagen's Lost Manuscript of the Collectanea", pp. 109-111.

¹¹ Presumably Herwagen exaggerated the difficulty as a way of anticipating objections and preparing an excuse for any editing mistakes that might be found in the volumes.

gian minuscule or Pre-Gothic script.¹² Herwagen's editing practices in other publications suggest that he favored twelfth-century manuscripts in general.¹³ Virtually none of the works in Herwagen's volumes date from later than about 1150, indicating that Herwagen's lost manuscripts were from the twelfth century or earlier.¹⁴

Most of the Pseudo-Bedan sermons in Herwagen's seventh volume are reprints from a 1535 Cologne edition by Johann Gymnicus.¹⁵ Herwagen and his associates, however, group a series of twenty-two sermons together and emphasize that this cluster is not from Gymnicus at all, but from an unprinted medieval manuscript. In its table of contents, the edition calls these new texts "diverse sermons to the laity" (*sermones ad populum uarii*) but, in the rubric, it refers to "some diverse sermons, discovered in an extremely old manuscript, until now never printed" (*sermones aliquot uarii, in uetustissimo codice reperti, hactenus numquam excusi*).¹⁶ No

¹² These five (all Continental) are from the Abbey of Saint-Victor in Paris, St Emmeram's in Regensburg, and Zwiefalten Abbey near Reutlingen. Four date to the late eleventh or the twelfth century and one to the ninth. None of these five contain sermons. Herwagen also printed some manuscript glosses on Bede's scientific works by Byrhtferth of Ramsey (d. ca. 1020), which evidently came from a lost twelfth-century English manuscript; GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 427-440; M. LAPIDGE, "Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the *Glossae Bridfertii in Bedam*", *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 17 (2007), pp. 384-400; for medieval scripts, A. DEROLEZ, *The Palaeography of Gothic Manuscript Books: From the Twelfth to the Early Sixteenth Century*, Cambridge, 2003.

¹³ Gorman maintains "since we know Herwagen preferred to use clearly written twelfth-century books, it is most unlikely that a fifteenth-century manuscript would have been used"; GORMAN, "Jacobus Pamelius", pp. 322-323.

¹⁴ Herwagen ascribed to Bede not only anonymous works, but also texts now rightly attributed to authors like Isidore of Seville, Otloh of Emmeram, Defensor of Ligugé, Wigbod, and William of Conches. The anonymous *De mundi celestis terrestrisque constitutione* dates no later than the twelfth century, and the Pseudo-Bedan commentary on Matthew is from the ninth century.

¹⁵ Gymnicus' edition contains a ninth-century East Frankish homiliary, falsely ascribed to Bede (the "Gymnicus Homiliary," also known as the Pseudo-Bedan Epistle Homiliary), which provided monastic sermons for the epistle lections. While not by Bede, the Gymnicus Homiliary is a fascinating work deserving deeper study, but it is beyond the scope of this article. Herwagen reproduces Gymnicus' edition in *Opera Bedae Venerabilis*, cols. 1-472; H. BARRÉ, *Les homéliaires carolingiens de l'école d'Auxerre: authenticité, inventaire, tableaux comparatifs, initia*, Vatican City, 1962, pp. 6-12, 211-213; J. MACHIELSEN, *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi*, Vol. 1: *Opera Homiletica, Pars B (Beda – Zeno)*, Turnhout, 1990, nos. 3871-4003, pp. 570-607.

¹⁶ Gorman, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 437, 440; there is no way to determine what Herwagen considered "extremely old" (*uetustissimo*). Elsewhere in his edition, though, Herwagen prints another text from what he calls an "ancient codex" (*antiquo codice*). This *antiquus* manuscript survives and is from the twelfth century (Paris, B. N. lat. 14489). The manuscript of the Herwagen Homiliary, thus, probably dated from the twelfth century at the latest in order to qualify as *uetustissimus*.

evidence intimates that the original manuscript assigned any of these sermons to Bede.¹⁷

In this article, I will call the twenty-two sermons from this manuscript “the Herwagen Homiliary,” for convenience. If the manuscript of the Herwagen Homiliary survives today, it should be easily recognizable.¹⁸ Since it remains unlocated, I believe it is lost. In addition to the Latin text, Herwagen’s edition likely preserves reliably the order in which these sermons were copied in the lost manuscript. The sermon titles, however, are Herwagen’s own inventions; they cannot be used as evidence for the original reading of the manuscript and a few of these titles misrepresent the actual topic of the sermon. Herwagen, for instance, entitles one sermon *Reuelatio Sancti Michaelis*, indicating that he believed the sermon was for the Feast of the Apparition of St. Michael on 8 May.¹⁹ The text of the sermon, how-

¹⁷ Herwagen may have assigned the homiliary to Bede on no grounds whatsoever. But perhaps the lost codex contained genuine Bedan text (e.g., some of his commentaries) alongside the twenty-two homilies. In his wishful thinking, Herwagen could have used this inclusion to justify assigning the entire manuscript to Bede.

¹⁸ In the middle of the homiliary, Herwagen incorporates a hymn to St. Scholastica, which he explicitly does not attribute to Bede. Herwagen likely found this poem in a different manuscript than the Herwagen Homiliary and included it in order to pad the page count; *Opera Bedae Venerabilis*, cols. 488-489; PL 95, cols. 1594A-1594A; this poem (inc.: *O benedicta soror Benedicti, numine Christi eximiiue patris*, with a separate senarius inc.: *Dulcis, adesto meis, praeclara Camoena, labellis*) survives in a manuscript in Beneventan script from the eleventh century (Monte Cassino, *Compactiones*, 10). Herwagen’s rubric states that the poem was written by a German poet at the shrine of St. Benedict at Monte Cassino (*Versus cuiusdam poetae, qui huc ad limina beati patris Benedicti ex Germania subiens, hos uersus ad honorem beatissimae sororis mirifice composuit*). The author also wrote another hymn to Scholastica (inc.: *sponsa decora dei petit alta Scolastica celi*), which Herwagen did not print. (This second hymn is in Vatican, BAV, Vat. lat. 1202, fols. 259v-262r, a lectionary from late eleventh-century Monte Cassino.) While earlier scholars ascribed these poems to various figures (e.g., Paul the Deacon, Peter Damian, Bertharius of Monte Cassino), now they are convincingly attributed to Alberic the Deacon of Monte Cassino. Alberic (d. 1088), was a native of Trier but wrote most of his works while schoolmaster at Monte Cassino; *Die Lateinischen Dichter des Deutschen Mittelalters: Die Ottonenzeit* – ed. K. STRECKER – G. SILAGI, Munich, 1979 (MGH Poetae, 5/3), pp. 596-600; J. SZÖVÉRFY, *Die Annalen der lateinischen Hymnendichtung: Ein Handbuch*, Berlin, 1964, pp. 391-393; O. J. BLUM, “Alberic of Monte Cassino and the Hymns and Rhythms Attributed to Saint Peter Damian”, *Traditio*, 12 (1956), pp. 87-148; *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina: Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis*, 4 vols., Brussels, 1898-1901, 1911, 1986, nos. 7519-7520 [hereafter BHL].

¹⁹ While the Herwagen preacher never names the feast, he speaks of the veneration of angels in the plural. Thus, the sermon misfits the Apparition of St. Michael on 8 May (originally a Beneventan feast). The more famous 29 September festival (a Roman feast), which honored all angels, must be in view. Medieval authors occasionally conflated these two feasts: *deus uolens angelos honorari in terra ab hominibus, hanc occasionem, ut legimus, primam ostendit ... Haec fuit prima causa quod memoria angelorum fuit in terra; ab hoc tempore usque in praesens sunt ecclesiae et festiuitates eorum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 17, PL 94, cols. 502D,

ever, reveals that it was for Michaelmas (the Feast of St. Michael and All Angels) on 29 September.²⁰

3. *Scholastic Sermons and the Wigbert Preacher*

Both Herwagen's Latin description and Pamelius' editing habits indicate that the lost codex of the Herwagen Homiliary was probably from the twelfth century.²¹ But as long as Herwagen's manuscript remains undiscovered, the contents of the sermons themselves serve as almost the sole source of information about the unity, provenance, and purpose of this collection. Thus, it is important to study the contents of the five sermons in the manuscript not written by the Herwagen preacher: the *Rex et Famulus* sermon,

503B; for similar sermons, see the interpolated Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, *Hom.*, 56, *PL* 95, cols. 1522B-1525A; Hrabanus Maurus, *Hom. ad Haistulfum*, 32, *PL* 110, cols. 60D-63C.

²⁰ When Herwagen's manuscripts survive, they show that the printer often composed new rubrics. The *Patrologia* edition has different titles again. This article uses Herwagen's titles. Herwagen's titles often do not fit the contents. For instance, Herwagen and Pamelius mistook the sermons for Christmas Dawn (which they entitled *De natiuitate domini*, as if it is for Christmas Day) and for the Assumption (titled simply *De sancta Maria*, without any reference to the specific feastday). Additionally, the Herwagen sermon for the *litanía maior* provides origin stories for two different holidays: the Roman Greater Litany on April 25 and Frankish Rogationtide on the three days before Ascension Thursday—for both deriving information from Gregory of Tours. Medieval authors often associate these two penitential seasons, because both occur in the springtime, include a procession and prayers for material blessings, and are usually termed *litaniae maiores* in Latin. *Litania* in Medieval Latin often translates as "procession," rather than as "litany." The homilist probably deliberately produced a non-specific sermon that could be adapted for either holiday. Herwagen and Pamelius, however, entitled the sermon with a singular *De maiori litanía*, rather than the more appropriate plural: *fratres charissimi, dignum est ut audiatís quia de causa litaníae rogationum fuerant inuentae ... quicumque hunc diem celebrauerit ... instituit sanctus Mamercus tres dies rogationum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 13, *PL* 94, cols. 499A-499D; cf. Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, 2.34, 10.1 – ed. B. KRUSCH, Hanover, 1884 (*MGH rer. Merov.*, 1.1), pp. 83-84, 477-481. For these two feasts, see, for instance, J. HILL, "The *Litaniae maiores* and *minores* in Rome, Francia and Anglo-Saxon England: Terminology, Texts and Traditions", *Early Medieval Europe*, 9 (2000), pp. 211-246; J. DYER, "Roman Processions of the Major Litany (*litaniae maiores*) from the Sixth to the Twelfth Century", in *Roma Felix: Formation and Reflections of Medieval Rome* – ed. É. Ó CARRAGAIN – C. N. DE VEGVAR, Aldershot, 2007, pp. 112-137; T. N. HALL – N. J. RISTUCCIA, "A Rogationtide Sermon from Eleventh-Century Salisbury", *Revue Bénédictine*, 123 (2013), pp. 42-53.

²¹ Both Jean Leclercq and Raymond Étaix suggested that the twenty-two sermons came from a twelfth- or thirteenth-century monastic codex. Leclercq specified, though, that he believed that most of the third book of Bede's homilies (the spurious homilies) date from the eighth or ninth centuries, although the manuscripts (and a few sermons) are later; LECLERCQ, "Le IIIe livre des homélies", p. 218; MACHIELSEN, *CPPMA*, IB, nos. 4008, 4058-4076, 4078, pp. 608, 612-618; Bede, *Opera: Pars III, Opera Homiletica* – ed. D. HURST, Turnhout, 1955 (*CC SL*, 122), pp. 383-384.

a Palm Sunday homily, and three sanctoral sermons (two for St. Wigbert and one for St. Scholastica). These five sermons, falling at the beginning and end of the collection, give hints to the history of the lost codex.

The Herwagen collection splits roughly in two, with the first half devoted to sanctoral feasts and the second to penitential seasons.²² Almost none of the sermons focus on the biblical exegesis of a Sunday lection.²³ The last two sermons in collection (nos. 21 and 22) are the latest additions to the homiliary. The penultimate sermon is a lengthy allegory about personified virtues.²⁴ Known as the *Rex et Famulus* sermon, this homily is the most influential text within the larger “four daughters of God” tradition; it survives in numerous manuscripts from the late twelfth century forward.²⁵ The theme of the four daughters of God became popular during

²² The ten of the first twelve sermons are all sanctoral: two for St. Wigbert’s day (August 13), and then one each for the feasts of St. Scholastica (February 10), Sts. Simon and Jude (October 28), St. Bartholomew (August 24), St. Lawrence (August 10), St. John the Evangelist (December 27), the discovery of the True Cross (May 3), Sts. Peter and Paul (June 29), and the Chains of St. Peter (August 1). The second half of the homiliary contains two sermons for penitential feasts (the Major Litany and Ash Wednesday) and four sermons on general penitential topics such as doomsday, the virtues and vices, and the afterlife. However, the divide between these two sections is incomplete, for the first half also includes a mystical interpretation of a prophetic vision (no. 5) and a sermon for Christmas Dawn (no. 11), while the second has two sanctoral sermons (for the assumption of Mary on August 15 and Michaelmas on September 29). The last two sermons were added later and do not fit well with the rest of the manuscript. Although most of the Herwagen sermons survive only in this manuscript, five are extant elsewhere, as noted in the footnotes. A list of the sermons, with incipits and explicits, follows this article.

²³ The homiliary contains a single temporal sermon. Admittedly, medieval sanctoral sermons do not usually focus on exegesis of the day’s lection, but on the life of the saint. But even sanctoral sermons sometimes interpret the lection (as, for instance, the Scholastica sermon does, Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, cols. 481A-483D). Moreover, sermons for penitential feasts like the Major Litany and Ash Wednesday, or those on generic penitential topics like the Last Judgment, often concentrate on exegesis. The Herwagen preacher’s lack of interest in exegesis, then, is striking. On early medieval sermons for the Major Litany and Ash Wednesday, see, for instance, N. J. RISTUCCIA, “The Transmission of Christendom: Ritual and Instruction in the Early Middle Ages”, Ph.D. Diss., University of Notre Dame, 2013.

²⁴ Herwagen Homiliary, 21, *PL* 94, cols. 505B-507A.

²⁵ The *Rex et Famulus* sermon develops on the text of Ps. 85:10/84:11 (cf. Ps. 89:14/88:15): *miser cordia et ueritas obuiauerunt sibi; iustitia et pax osculatae sunt*. In the homily, these four virtues (Mercy, Truth, Justice, and Peace) are daughters of a king who quarrel about whether the king should pardon a disobedience serf. Their brother (Christ) reconciles them. Leclercq refers to this allegory under the French name “the Trial of Heaven/Mercy” (the *Procès de Paradis/Miséricorde*), but in English it is usually called “the Four Daughters of God,” the title of Hope Travers’ study; LECLERCQ, “Le IIIe livre des homélies”, pp. 217-218; H. TRAVER, *The Four Daughters of God: A Study of the Versions of this Allegory with Especial Reference to those in Latin, French, and English*, Philadelphia, 1907; C. W. MARX, *The Devil’s Rights and the Redemption in the Literature of Medieval England*, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 58-79; T. HUNT,

the twelfth century, due to the writings of Hugh of Saint-Victor and Bernard of Clairvaux.²⁶ Barthélemy Hauréau, who edited a version of the *Rex et Famulus* sermon from a fourteenth-century manuscript, ascribed the sermon to Peter of Poitiers, a canon at the Abbey of Saint-Victor in Paris at the turn of the thirteenth century, because Peter wrote a number of other works in the same manuscript.²⁷ Regardless of the exact authorship, the *Rex et Famulus* sermon post-dates its primary source (Bernard's homily on the annunciation).

The final sermon in the collection is a typological interpretation of the standard lection (Matt. 21:1-9) for Palm Sunday.²⁸ The homily explains the parable of the Good Samaritan as a typology of original sin and the redemption of mankind and the Triumphal Entry as a symbol of the mortification of the flesh and the corporal acts of mercy.²⁹ Leclercq noted that this sermon contains early scholastic language, pointing especially to the

"The Four Daughters of God': A Textual Contribution", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 56 (1982), pp. 287-316; M. I. CREEK, "The Four Daughters of God in the *Gesta Romanorum* and the Court of Sapience", *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 57 (1942), pp. 951-965; K. SARAVAARA, "The Use of Robert Grosseteste's *Chateau d'amour* as a Source of the *Cursor Mundi*: Additional Evidence", *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 68 (1967), pp. 184-193.

²⁶ Hugh's text is earlier and focuses on only two daughters (Mercy and Truth). Bernard developed Hugh's idea into a much longer and more complex sermon. Hugh acquired the idea of the four daughters from a tenth-century Jewish midrash on Ps. 85:10. Many vernacular versions of the story of the four daughters appeared from the thirteenth century onwards, particularly in Middle French and Middle English; Hugh of Saint-Victor, *Adnotationes Elucidatoriae*, 63, PL 177, cols. 623C-625D; Bernard of Clairvaux, *Sermo in adnuntiatione dominica*, 1 – ed. J. LECLERCQ – H. M. ROCHAIS (*Sancti Bernardi opera*, vol. 5), Rome, 1968, pp. 13-29.

²⁷ The *Rex et Famulus* sermon must antedate both its earliest manuscript, from the late twelfth century, and Robert Grosseteste's *Chateau d'amour* (which used it as a source). Barthélemy Hauréau edited the sermon from Paris, B.N. lat. 14886 and Paris, B.N. lat. 5556. Hauréau's attribution to Peter has not convinced later scholars like Leclercq and Jean Rivière; B. HAURÉAU, *Notices et extraits de quelques manuscrits latins de la Bibliothèque nationale*, vol. 3, Paris, 1892, pp. 260-264; J. RIVIÈRE, *Le dogme de la rédemption au début du Moyen Âge*, Paris, 1934, pp. 309-362.

²⁸ The Palm Sunday sermon differs greatly in both content and style from the Herwagen preacher's seventeen sermons. The Palm Sunday homily focuses on the fall and the atonement, like the *Rex et Famulus* sermon but unlike the rest of the Herwagen collection (with its interest in legends of the saints and penance before doomsday); Herwagen Homiliary, 22, PL 94, cols. 507A-507C; BARRÉ, *Les homéliaires*, pp. 50, 213, 258.

²⁹ Already in Late Antiquity, Christian writers interpreted the parable of the Good Samaritan as a symbol for Adam's fall and redemption. This sermon uses the parable to exhort the congregation to charity, Lenten fasting, and the corporal acts of mercy: *opera misericordiae sunt, uestire nudos ... debetis subtrahere uentri, et dare pauperibus: sic ieiunium uestrum erit ordinatum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 22, PL 94, cols. 507B-507C.

use of *naturalia* and *gratuita*.³⁰ Indeed, Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, written ca. 1150, is an undeniable influence on the Palm Sunday sermon.³¹ These last two sermons (nos. 21 and 22), therefore, are a later supplement to the Herwagen codex, probably added in the second half of the twelfth century. Unless Herwagen's manuscript is found, the date of copying will remain unclear. Perhaps a later copyist literally appended two more sermons onto a pre-existing eleventh-century manuscript. But a single scribe or group of scribes may have copied the whole Herwagen manuscript at the same time from a variety of exemplars (one of which held the sermons of the Herwagen preacher).

Leclercq has already argued, cogently, that a single author composed the first three sermons in the Herwagen Homiliary, who, for the sake of convenience, shall be called the Wigbert preacher after the topic of his first two sermons.³² The Wigbert homilist must have received a grammatical education, for he is a superb orator, weaving rhetorical tropes such as apostrophe, theme and variation, parallelism, and rhetorical questions through-

³⁰ This pairing is a standard contrast between natural human endowments and grace-given endowments when discussing the freedom of the will. These two terms often appear in parallel in scholastic writings from the twelfth century onward, but are unknown as a pairing before 1100. The sermon's Eucharistic interest also suggests a high medieval origin; LECLERCQ, "Le IIIe livre des homélies", p. 218; *spoliatus a gratuitis, uulneratus in naturalibus ... iste est ille qui seipsum coxit in clibano passionis: panis uiuus effectus, panis est angelorum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 22, PL 94, col. 507A.

³¹ Compare, for instance: *uulneratus quidem in naturalibus bonis, quibus non est priuatus, alioquin non posset fieri reparatio, spoliatus uero gratuitis, quae per gratiam naturalibus addita fuerant*, Peter Lombard, *Sententiae*, 2.D.15, PL 192, col. 707; cf. Bandinus, *De mundi creatione*, PL 192, cols. 1053D-1054A; other authors, particularly in the thirteenth century, use this language while discussing Lombard's text or the Good Samaritan. Peter Lombard also influences one other phrase in the sermon: *panem quippe angelorum ibi manducat homo; hic carnes assas igni, quia panis ille clibano passionis est excoctus*, Peter Lombard, *Serm.*, 43, PL 171, col. 562B; cf. *iste est ille qui seipsum coxit in clibano passionis: panis uiuus effectus, panis est angelorum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 22, PL 94, col. 507B; in the *Patrologia*, this Lombard sermon is wrongly ascribed to Hildebert of Lavardin. The Palm Sunday sermon also contains language (e.g., *circumcidendi sunt oculi ne uideant uanitatem*) borrowed from other sources.

³² Leclercq points out that these sermons have a similar organization and archaic Latin vocabulary (he mentions *malesuada*, *altithronus*, *paginula*, *pompaticus*, *tonitrus*, *fundamen*, and *balatus*). Leclercq could have added *ergastulum*, *panniculus*, *dissociabilis*, *Syrena* (although not all of these are classical poetic words). The Wigbert preacher employs some phrases repeatedly (for instance, *famulus dei*, *ferculum*, *derelinquere sperantes*). Most of the sermons in the homiliary are short, around a column of Latin in Herwagen's edition. The Wigbert preacher, in contrast, composed the longest texts in the Herwagen Homiliary (the sermon on St. Scholastica, for instance, fills twelve Latin columns); LECLERCQ, "Le IIIe livre des homélies", pp. 212, 217-218.

out his sermons.³³ His three homilies focus on the lives of two Benedictine saints: Wigbert of Fritzlar and Scholastica of Nursia.

The body of these sermons supply minimal information about these saints. In his first sermon for the Feast of St. Wigbert (August 13), the Wigbert preacher merely warns about doomsday and describes the three saintly categories of virgins, martyrs, and confessors.³⁴ In the second sermon for Wigbert's feast, the preacher finally tells of Wigbert's life, but everything he says could apply to virtually any confessor. Wigbert fasted, prayed, stood vigils, and gave away money.³⁵ The only facts that the Wigbert preacher mentions are that Wigbert was born to wealth (as were most medieval confessors) and that he was foreign.³⁶ Nothing resembling biographic details or even a postmortem miracle story appears in either Wigbert sermon. Perhaps the Wigbert preacher simply chose, for whatever reason, to remain at the level of typology. But, more likely, the Wigbert preacher knew little about Wigbert's life and struggled to build, without any specifics, a homily praising

³³ A. LENTINI, "Il sermone di s. Bertario su s. Scolastica", *Benedictina*, 1 (1947), pp. 207-210; Herwagen Homiliary, 2, *PL* 94, cols. 479D-480A; Prudentius, *Psychomachia*, ll. 758-763 – ed. M. CUNNINGHAM, Turnhout, 1966 (*CC SL*, 126), p. 176; the Wigbert preacher quotes from early medieval grammatical school texts (Servius' commentary, Prudentius' *Psychomachia*): *secundum grammaticos, charitas media species est, dum inter bonos et malos charitas esse possit*, Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, col. 487D; LENTINI, "Il sermone", p. 228, l. 122; cf. *species sane medium est; nam et bona et mala est*, Maurus Servius Honoratus, *In Vergilii carmina, Commentarii in Aeneidos* 2.407 – ed. G. THILO – H. HAGEN, Leipzig, 1881, vol. 1, p. 284.

³⁴ Wigbert of Fritzlar (ca. 670-747) was an Anglo-Saxon follower of Boniface who left his homeland for the Continent probably in 717. After Boniface cut down the sacred oak of "Jupiter" near Fritzlar and established a monastery there in 724, he made Wigbert its first abbot. (After ca. 737 he was also the abbot of Ohrdurf.) Wigbert taught a number of missionaries—such as Sturm and Lull. Wigbert was originally buried at Fritzlar, but Lull translated his body to Hersfeld in the 780s. The Wigbert preacher is aware that Wigbert is a confessor (*cum confessoribus ex quorum collegio iste dei famulus est*) and speaks about the "divine histories" (i.e. hagiographies) where one can read of these categories of saints; Herwagen Homiliary, 1, *PL* 94, cols. 477B-478B; H. WUNDER, *Die Wigberttradition in Hersfeld und Fritzlar*, Ph.D. Diss., Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1964.

³⁵ *Restat igitur adhuc aliquid de beato Wigbertho breui sermone narrare ... erat quippe uir iste sanctus Wigbertus, sicut sacra fama narrat ... eius uero secreta conuersatio in uigiliis et orationibus, uel etiam in ieiuniis ... Ab infantia enim cuncta quae habere potuit, ad pietatis opus largifluis manibus tribuens: ut Christum pro nobis factum egenum, egens ipse sequeretur. Quis enim tam loquax in lingua, ut sigillatim omnia mirabilia uel beneficia, quae per illum deus operatur, assiduus explicare ualeat uerbis? ... Hospes et inops in mundo fuit; quamuis namque terrenis nutritus esset usibus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 2, *PL* 94, cols. 479A-479C; Leclercq remarked on the boiler-plate nature of these sermons' knowledge about Wigbert; LECLERCQ, "Le IIIe livre des homélies", p. 217.

³⁶ Wigbert was an Anglo-Saxon, although he worked in East Francia: *patriam cognationemque, et amicos saeculares, feruente fide, pro amore dei dereliquit*, Herwagen Homiliary, 2, *PL* 94, col. 480D.

the saint. If so, then the homilist could not have read Lupus of Ferrières' *Vita Wigberti* and must have lived long enough after the death of the saint in 747 that no one still lived who remembered details of Wigbert's life.³⁷

Similarly, the Wigbert preacher's homily for the feast of St. Scholastica (February 10) does not bother mentioning the saint until the sermon is half over.³⁸ Once the Wigbert preacher describes Scholastica's life, he quotes almost in their entirety the two chapters about Scholastica in Gregory the Great's *Dialogues*, interspersing quotations with exegesis on the hagiography.³⁹ Evidently, then, the preacher was happy to provide biographical details when he had a reliable hagiographic source for them (strengthening the theory that he did not have such a *uita* for Wigbert).⁴⁰ The Wigbert

³⁷ Lupus of Ferrières, *Vita Wigberti*, *PL* 119, cols. 679C-694A; M. FLECK, *Leben und Wundertaten des heiligen Wigbert*, Marburg, 2010; Lupus wrote the first *Vita* of Wigbert in 836 at the request of Abbot Bun of Hersfeld. (The Wigbert preacher, thus, probably did not live in Hersfeld.) The Herwagen sermons on Wigbert are ascribed to Lupus in *PL* 119, cols. 693B-698C. This misattribution is based solely on the fact that Lupus wrote a hagiography of Wigbert (a hagiography, moreover, which the preacher did not know). Slight differences occur between the Latin texts in *PL* 119 and in *PL* 94. The incipit of the first sermon, for instance, is "gaudete et exultate" in *PL* 119; H. BARRÉ, "Les homéliaires carolingiens de Mondsee", *Revue Bénédictine*, 71 (1961), p. 71; *BHL* 8879-8880.

³⁸ The long introduction to the Scholastica sermon interprets a gospel lection (the parable of the pearl, Matt. 13:45-46). The homilist understands this parable as esoteric teaching about Christ and devotes attention to various typologies for the church. The cleric also wonders why the parable compares Christ and merchants, for merchants, in his opinion, are duplicitous and greedy; Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94.481A-483D; medieval clerics often used this pericope (at times, extended to Matt. 13:44-52) as a reading for a feast of a generic virgin saint. See, for instance, Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel, *Collectiones*, *PL* 102, cols. 547B-548C; Haymo of Auxerre, *Hom.*, 11, *PL* 118, cols. 790D-795B; the interpolated Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, *Hom.* 93, *PL* 95, cols. 1561C-1566A; Radulf Ardent, *Serm.*, 33, *PL* 155, cols. 1621D-1626D; Bruno of Segni, *Hom.*, 96, *PL* 165, cols. 857C-860A; Gottfried of Admont, *Hom.*, 22, *PL* 174, cols. 719B-724D; Innocent III, *Serm.*, 12, *PL* 217, cols. 645D-650A.

³⁹ Scholastica, Benedict of Nursia's twin sister, is the founding figure of Benedictine nuns. Gregory's hagiography tells one miracle story about Scholastica (her prayers bring a thunderstorm) and then describe how she was buried at Monte Cassino in the same tomb as her brother after her death ca. 547. Benedict himself supposedly buried her and told the monks to place his body beside her when he died. This section from Gregory's hagiography may have served as a sanctoral reading for February 10 at the Wigbert preacher's church; Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, cols. 483B, 484A-488C; Gregory I, *Dialogues*, 2.33-34, *PL* 66, cols. 194A-196C; *BHL* 7514-7517; the cleric signals he is borrowing from a source by introducing quotations with words like *sequitur* and starts by stating that he is using Gregory's *Dialogues*: *libet de eius uitae meritis aliquid de uita beatissimi Benedicti huic opusculo introducere*, Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, col. 483B; on the life of Scholastica, see M. R. BOO – J. M. BRAUN, "Emerging from the Shadows: St. Scholastica", in *Medieval Women Monastics: Wisdom's Wellsprings* – ed. M. SCHMITT – L. KULZER, Collegeville, MN, 1996, pp. 1-12.

⁴⁰ Certainly, the Wigbert preacher likes to quote sources in his hagiography. In addition to Gregory and the Bible, he alludes to Servius and Prudentius. In his first sermon on Wigbert, he even tells his congregation that he had read hagiographies (*legimus in diuinis histori-*

preacher never indicates awareness of any extra information about Scholastica, except what he could glean from the *Dialogues*.⁴¹

Since Wigbert never acquired a widespread cult during the Middle Ages, the two sermons on this saint are clues to the provenance of the Wigbert preacher.⁴² Although the speaker asserts that all venerate Wigbert, he believes his audience held some stronger claim to St. Wigbert's patronage than other Christians had.⁴³ Thus, the homilist and his congregation presumably lived near a shrine of St. Wigbert, perhaps at Fritzlar or Fulda.⁴⁴

The Wigbert preacher must have worked in early Middle Ages because the Scholastica sermon survives in nearly a dozen manuscripts, dating from

is) about the various categories of saints. It would seem rather bizarre for the preacher not to mention reading a "divine history" about Wigbert here, if he ever had; Herwagen Homiliary, 1, *PL* 94, col. 78A.

⁴¹ When explicating Gregory, the Wigbert preacher becomes speculative and even allegorical. He wonders, for instance, if Scholastica visited Benedict annually due to the long distance, or perhaps to bring a gift. He uses Scholastica's visit as a symbol of the soul's ascent to God, discovers mystical meaning in Scholastica's prayer posture (head slumped, fingers intertwined), and extrapolates an etymology for Scholastica's name; Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, cols. 483C-483D, 484C, 485D; the Wigbert preacher never quotes from Alberic the Deacon's sermon on Scholastica or the later life of Scholastica, written by an anonymous monk from Monte Cassino. This later life was edited in the seventeenth century by Jean Gamans from a now-lost legendary from Bööddenken Abbey in Westphalia. Both of these later works on Scholastica were composed at Monte Cassino; Alberic the Deacon, *Sermo in Sanctam Scholasticam*, *PL* 66, cols. 941C-950B; *Vita Scholasticae*, *AASS*, Feb. 2, col. 402D-404B; *BHL* 7522-7523; H. MORETUS, "De Magno Legendario Bodecensi", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 27 (1908), pp. 342-343.

⁴² In his sermons, the Wigbert preacher discusses nuns as well as monks, asks saints to intercede for monastics and lay people alike, and exhorts his congregation to perform lay acts like almsgiving and church attendance. The preacher's audience was evidently mixed, including lay people as well as religious of both genders. Mixed congregations were standard in the early Middle Ages before rigorous claustration and strict differentiation between monasteries and parish churches arose: *intermediate pro uobis commissis, postulate pro nobis afflictis, rogate pro nostris delictis, poscite Christum non solum pro monachis commissis, sed etiam pro uestris ancillis, ut omnis aetas, omnis sexus, omnis ordo, qui uestris praeceptis colla submittunt ... gaudia aeterna concupiscant*, Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, cols. 489B-489C; LENTINI, "Il sermone", p. 231, ll. 145-146; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 1, *PL* 94, cols. 477B-479A; Herwagen Homiliary, 2, *PL* 94, col. 479D.

⁴³ The preacher mentions that his audience had often heard of the Wigbert's miracles to the laity: *totus christianus populus summa ueneratione de solemnitate illius gaudeat: maxime namque nos, qui in suum apud deum patrocinium hic et in futuro confidimus ... tanta in praesentia populi miracula, sicut saepe audistis, pro eius laude nobilitauit*, Herwagen Homiliary, 2, *PL* 94, col. 479A.

⁴⁴ In addition to those two monasteries, Wigbert was venerated elsewhere around Hesse and Thuringia in places like Mainz, Erfurt, Hersfeld, Ohrdurf, Osterhausen, Paderborn, and Ingelheim. Wigbert received little-to-no cult outside this area. The Scholastica sermon does not suggest such a close relationship between saint and congregation. The preacher's church probably did not have relics of Scholastica (only of Wigbert); WUNDER, *Wigbertstradition*.

around 1000 until the end of the Middle Ages and almost all from Italy.⁴⁵ Indeed, some historians have ascribed the Herwagen homily on St. Scholastica to Bertharius, the abbot of Monte Cassino (856-883).⁴⁶ The attribution to Bertharius even appears in an eleventh-century rubric in a manuscript containing the sermon (Monte Cassino, 107).⁴⁷ This attribution may be ancient, but it is also dubious. Those scholars who support it have overlooked that the Herwagen homily on Scholastica was written by the same author as the sermons on St. Wigbert. Indeed, the preacher associates his congregation with Wigbert's cult much more than with Scholastica's.⁴⁸ No evidence indicates that Wigbert received any veneration in Monte Cassino (his cult is focused on Hesse and Thuringia).⁴⁹ Moreover, rubric attribu-

⁴⁵ The popularity of this sermon is due to its early adoption in Monte Cassino (the center of Scholastica's cult) and elsewhere in Italy as a reading for the monastic Night Office on February 10; LENTINI, "Il sermone", pp. 200-201.

⁴⁶ BARRÉ, *Les homéliaires*, pp. 50, 213, 332; for a superior edition of this sermon, LENTINI, "Il sermone", pp. 212-232; on the chief manuscript, see L. TOSTI, *Bibliotheca Casinensis, seu, Codicum manuscriptorum qui in tabulario Casinensi asservantur*, vol. 2, Hildesheim, 2004, p. 464.

⁴⁷ Lentini suggested that only the second half of the sermon (the section on Scholastica, rather than the lection exegesis) is by Bertharius. He believed the first half was genuinely Bedan. The rubric reads "omilia domini Bertharii abbatis"; LENTINI, "Il sermone", pp. 212-232; B. VALTORTA, *Clavis Scriptorum Latinorum Medii Aevi, Auctores Italiae (700-1000)*, Florence, 2006, pp. 67-70; Peter the Deacon, the early twelfth-century librarian and historian of Monte Cassino, duplicates this attribution. Peter's testimony does not carry much weight, as he was a poor historian and known forger. Peter probably had read the rubric in Monte Cassino, 107 and was repeating this manuscript's heading; Peter the Deacon, *De Viris Illustribus Casinensis Coenobii*, 12, *PL* 173, cols. 1021A-1022A; in this same work, Peter the Deacon asserts that Bruno of Segni wrote a sermon on Scholastica. If so, this sermon does not appear in any edition of Bruno's works (cf. *PL* 165). Peter could just be misattributing. When discussing Alberic the Deacon, Peter notes that Alberic wrote verses on Scholastica but not that he wrote a sermon on her as well. Could Peter have known a copy of Alberic's sermon on Scholastica that ascribed the sermon to Bruno? Cf. Peter the Deacon, *De Viris Illustribus Casinensis Coenobii*, 21, 34, *PL* 173, cols. 1033B, 1042B.

⁴⁸ In the Scholastica sermon, the Wigbert preacher never suggests that his audience lived near the tomb of Benedict and Scholastica, even though he quotes a section from Gregory's *Dialogues* describing Scholastica's burial. If Abbot Bertharius was the Wigbert preacher, one would expect him to mention that Scholastica's tomb was located where he was preaching. An abbot at Monte Cassino would probably also have had access to oral traditions about Scholastica (the Wigbert preacher only cites from Gregory's *Dialogues*); Herwagen Homiliary, 3, *PL* 94, cols. 488C-488D; a later Monte Cassino hagiography mentions that Scholastica's body was in the Oratory of John the Baptist, which was presumably well-known to the Cassinese congregation; *Vita Scholasticae*, 8, *AASS*, Feb, col. 2.404A; Cf. Alberic the Deacon, *Sermo in Sanctam Scholasticam*, *PL* 66, cols. 941C-950B; *Vita Scholasticae*, *AASS*, Feb. 2, cols. 402D-404B.

⁴⁹ The earliest surviving ordinal from Monte Cassino, from the late eleventh century, never mentions St. Wigbert. This ordinal, admittedly, depicts the Franco-Roman rite which the

tions from eleventh-century Monte Cassino are not always trustworthy.⁵⁰ The manuscript ascription to Bertharius, therefore, is probably unreliable.⁵¹ Instead, the Wigbert preacher was likely a German cleric teaching in Hesse or Thuringia during the ninth or tenth century.⁵²

In addition to the seventeen sermons of the Herwagen preacher, then, the Herwagen Homiliary contains five homilies by other clergymen. These five indicate that the lost codex was compiled at the end of the twelfth century but included sermons dating as early as the Carolingian period. The copyists who produced the manuscript were almost certainly Benedictines from Hesse or Thuringia (hence their interest in Wigbert and Scholastica). But they also had access to recent works of French scholasticism—such as the *Rex et Famulus* sermon. A twelfth-century codex from Southern Germany fits Herwagen's known editing practices, strengthening

abbey adopted under Abbot Desiderius (1058-1087), rather than the earlier Milanese liturgy; T. F. KELLY, *The Ordinal of Montecassino and Benevento*, Fribourg, 2008, pp. 49-56.

⁵⁰ Early manuscripts of southern Italian texts regularly lack headings, causing later scribes to insert the names of authors afterwards. One example of this practice is a spurious rubric in Monte Cassino, 187 assigning the *Anticimenon*, by the seventh-century Spanish theologian Julian of Toledo, to none other than Abbot Bertharius. Peter the Deacon repeats this false ascription (he must have read Monte Cassino, 187) in the same passage that he discusses the Scholastica homily: *Bertarius ... scripsit non contemnenda opuscula ... de beata Scholastica homiliam descripsit: librum quoque difficillimum sententiarum tam ueteris quam noui testamenti patrauit ipsumque Anticimenon appellauit*, Peter the Deacon, *De Viris Illustribus Casinensis Coenobii*, 12, PL 173, cols. 1021A-1022A; Peter extends upon information from Leo of Ostia's chronicle of Monte Cassino, which just states that Bertharius producing *nonnullos tractatus atque sermones* rather than specifying a sermon about Scholastica; Leo of Ostia, *Chronicon Casinense*, 1.33, PL 173, col. 533A; C. M. RADDING – F. NEWTON, *Theology, Rhetoric, and Politics in the Eucharistic Controversy 1078-1079*, New York, 2003, pp. 33-40, 53-56; H. BLOCH, "Montecassino's Teachers and Library in the High Middle Ages", in *Le scuole nell'Occidente latino dell'alto medioevo*, Spoleto, 1972, pp. 572-575.

⁵¹ This manuscript ascription may just indicate that Bertharius established the Scholastica sermon as a standard reading in the Cassinese Night Office. Later Italian monks could have concluded wrongly that Bertharius wrote the sermon, an understandable mistake. If so, then Bertharius' death in 883 is a *terminus ante quem* for the Scholastica sermon. (If not, then the first manuscript ca. 1000 is the *terminus*.) The erroneous ascription of the *Anticimenon* to Bertharius stems from exactly this sort of error. Bertharius was involved in the copying of the manuscript of Julian's work which Leo of Ostia and Peter the Deacon read (Monte Cassino, 187). An eleventh-century hand added a short poem before the *Anticimenon* which mentions Bertharius' role; RADDING – NEWTON, *Theology*, pp. 33-40; BLOCH, "Montecassino's Teachers", pp. 572-575; another separate sermon on Scholastica is ascribed to Bertharius, perhaps equally fallaciously; BHL 7521.

⁵² Scholastica had a small but important cult in Francia. Although particularly connected with Fleury and Le Mans, Scholastica also received veneration in Hesse and Thuringia, especially at Fulda. Authors like Hrabanus Maurus and Rudolf of Fulda mention her reverently; J. RAAIJMAKERS, *The Making of the Monastic Community of Fulda, c. 744 – c. 900*, Cambridge, 2012, pp. 141-142.

this theory of origin. Pamelius perhaps found the lost tome in the library at St. Emmeram's Abbey in Regensburg or at Zwiefalten Abbey near Reutlingen, both of which supplied Pamelius with other manuscripts he used elsewhere in the eight-volume edition.⁵³

4. *The Style and Sources of the Herwagen Preacher*

The middle seventeen sermons of the Herwagen Homiliary are the work of a single cleric, who will be referred to as the Herwagen preacher. Most of these sermons are brief readings for feasts of the liturgical year, borrowing heavily on Late Antique hagiographic texts. Four are penitential sermons warning the congregation to repent their sins before death and doomsday and one sermon (no. 5) is hard to classify. The cleric probably designed these more general sermons to serve as *Quando Volueris* homilies, which could be adapted for penitential seasons like Lent or Rogationtide.

The language, style, and compositional method of these homilies reveal that they are all the work of a single cleric.⁵⁴ Concision and limited originality mark his preaching. This group of seventeen sermons sharply contrasts with the oratorical compositions of the first three Herwagen homilies. The Wigbert preacher and the Herwagen preacher were not the same person; indeed, they lived centuries apart. The Herwagen preacher adapts from some of the same sources repeatedly in his teaching. Four of the Herwagen preacher's sermons, for instance, depend heavily on the *Virtutes apostolorum*, the main gathering of Latin apocryphal Acts of the Apostles during the early Middle Ages.⁵⁵ Due to the great diversity between manu-

⁵³ GORMAN, "Canon of Bede's Works", pp. 427-440.

⁵⁴ Focusing on sections from the sermons that are substantially original in their diction (rather than on quotations), these are only some of the Herwagen preacher's stylistic preferences: *facio* + infinitive, *et ita factum est* (and similar phrases), *ad ultimum*, *permanere in*, *mortui esse*, *facere per incantationem*, *inducia*, *ad similitudinem*, *notandum est*, *nihil aliud*, *qua de causa*, *fetor*, *capillus*, *uestimentum*, *uoluntas dei*, emotion verbs modified by *ualde*, *uade*, *stringere*, *ego sum*, *expansus*, *mors subitanea*; many of these features are common in Late Latin, but they are quite distinct from the classicizing styles of both the Wigbert preacher and the *Virtutes apostolorum*; Herwagen Homiliary, 4-20, *PL* 94, cols. 422B-423B, 489C-505A.

⁵⁵ The sermons on Simon and Jude, Bartholomew, John, and Peter and Paul (nos. 4, 6, 8, and 10) adapt from the *Virtutes apostolorum*. This series of acts (sometimes wrongly called the Collection of Pseudo-Abdias, after the fictitious author of one of the *uitae*) survives in dozens of manuscripts from the late eighth century forward. The identity and location of the various authors and compilers of this series of acts remains unknown (although Gregory of Tours connects to one); E. ROSE, *Ritual Memory: The Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles and Liturgical Commemoration in the Early Medieval West* (c. 500-1215), Leiden, 2009, pp. 16-17, 20-22, 35-36; E. ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Origin, Aim, and Use", *Traditio*, 68 (2013), pp. 111-150; E. ROSE, "Abdias scriptor vitarum sanctorum apostolorum? The 'Col-

scripts of the *Virtutes*, however, it is difficult to know what form of the text the Herwagen preacher read.⁵⁶ The *Visio Pauli*, similarly, provides material for another three sermons (this text too is highly variable in manuscripts).⁵⁷ Even the contents of these sermons evince the consistency of the Herwagen preacher's concerns. All the saints he preaches about are either apostles or early Christian figures; no medieval saints appear. And most of them are directly linked to the city of Rome (Peter, Paul, John, Lawrence, Silvester, Helena, Quirinus, Balbina, Gregory the Great).⁵⁸

At times, the Herwagen preacher assembles his homilies out of a series of extracts from a source. Consider, for instance, his compositional method in his sermons for the Feast of St. Simon and St. Jude (October 28) and for the Feast of St. Bartholomew (August 24).⁵⁹ His homilies for these feasts

lection of Pseudo-Abdias' reconsidered", *Revue d'histoire des Textes*, 8 (2013), pp. 227-268; A. M. O'LEARY, "Apostolic *Passiones* in Early Anglo-Saxon England", in *Apocryphal Texts and Traditions in Anglo-Saxon England* – ed. K. POWELL – D. SCRAGG, Cambridge, 2003, pp. 103-119; G. BESSON, "La collection dite du Pseudo-Abdias: Un essai de définition à partir de l'étude des manuscrits", *Apocrypha*, 11 (2000), pp. 181-194.

⁵⁶ The individual apostolic acts from the *Virtutes* could circulate separately or as part of a coherent collection. In the manuscripts, the collection has no fixed title, order, or even contents (scribes often interpolated additional hagiographic texts, with the material on Peter and Paul particularly unstable). The complete edition of the *Virtutes* dates from the turn of the eighteenth century and is entirely unsatisfactory; J. A. FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti*, 2 vols., Hamburg, 1703; for a better edition of selected *acta* from the series, see R. A. LIPSIVS – M. BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, 3 vols., Leipzig, 1891-1903; fortunately, a new edition of all the acts is soon anticipated; E. ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Editorial Problems and Principles" *Apocrypha*, 23 (2010), pp. 11-46; E. ROSE, "Paratexts in the *Virtutes Apostolorum*", *Viator*, 44 (2013), pp. 369-385.

⁵⁷ Herwagen Homiliary, 14, 16, 19, *PL* 94, cols. 499D-500B, 501A-502D, 503B-504B; the complex redaction history of the *Visio* is discussed more below.

⁵⁸ Seven sermons recount narratives set in the city of Rome; see Herwagen Homiliary, 7-10, 12-13, 18, *PL* 94, cols. 422B-423B, 491B-498A, 498C-499D; another takes place in Italy, Herwagen Homiliary, 17, *PL* 94, cols. 503A-503B.

⁵⁹ According to Latin traditions, the apostles Simon the Zealot and Jude Thaddaeus died together. Hence, they were celebrated on the same day in the Latin West. In the sermon, Simon and Jude overwhelm the power of two Persian magicians (Zaroes and Arphaxat) and convert a pagan ruler and his people. Much of this story is based on Moses and Aaron's encounter with Jannes and Jambres. Simon and Jude had a cult at many locations, but perhaps the most famous center for their veneration is the collegiate church of Simon and Jude in Goslar (which served as the church for the imperial palace at Goslar from its construction in the 1040s until the decline of the palace's import in the mid-thirteenth century). Simon and Jude were also the patrons of the Abbey of Hersfeld, where Lull translated Wigbert's relics. For the veneration of Simon and Jude, ROSE, *Ritual Memory*, pp. 213-250; J. A. L. KILBURN, "The Contrasted 'Other' in the Old English Apocryphal Acts of Matthew, Simon and Jude", *Neophilologus*, 87:1 (2003), pp. 137-151; *BHL* 7749, 7753; this sermon is also extant in a fifteenth-century lectionary: Autun, Bibl. mun., S 121 (99D), no. 91; C. MAÎTRE, *Catalogue des manuscrits conservés à Autun Bibliothèque municipale Société éduenne*, Turnhout, 2004,

are merely two short paragraphs of adapted quotations from much longer texts in the *Virtutes apostolorum*.⁶⁰ The apocryphal acts in the *Virtutes* are protracted, including many miracle accounts and large amounts of dialogue.⁶¹ In these two sermons, the Herwagen homilist condenses the story so much that the stilted Latin no longer makes sense.⁶² Sentence fragments from pages located far apart in Fabricius' edition of these *acta* are pressed

p. 176; for the cult of Bartholomew; ROSE, *Ritual Memory*, pp. 79-123; U. WESTERBERGH, *Anastasius Bibliothecarius, Sermo Theodori Studitae de Sancto Bartholomeo Apostolo*, Stockholm, 1963, pp. xi-xiv, 91-95; for a fourteenth-century copy of this sermon (found in Venice, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, lat. 507, fols. 155v-156v), see H. FROS, "Inédits non recensés dans la BHL", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 102 (1984), p. 170; G. VALENTINELLI, *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum: Codices manuscripti latini*, vol. 2, Venice, 1869, pp. 165-166, 176-177; BHL 1002, 1015.

⁶⁰ Herwagen Homiliary, 4, 6, PL 94, cols. 489C-490A, 490C-491B; cf. *Passio Simonis et Iudae*, cc. 7-9, 16, 19-20, 23, FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus*, vol. 1, pp. 608, 611-613, 623-624, 627-628, 635-636; since manuscripts of the *Virtutes* vary greatly, there is no way to know exactly what the preacher's text looked like. Even Fabricius' faulty edition, though, demonstrates obvious verbal parallels. These parallels might prove greater still once a new edition allows further comparison. The preacher paraphrases many of his extracts, but this might reflect his usage of different readings than Fabricius provides. Compare, for instance, the preacher's *ingressi regionem Persidis per uoluntatem Dei, inuenerunt duos magos, Zaroen et Arfaxat, qui fugerunt a facie Matthaei apostoli de Aethiopia* with the *passio's per reuelationem spiritus sancti ... regionem ingressi, inuenerunt ... duos ibi magos, Zaroen et Arfaxat, qui a facie Matthaei apostoli de Aethiopia fugerunt*; Herwagen Homiliary, 4, PL 94, col. 489C; for Bartholomew, he excerpts from *Passio Bartholomaei*, cc. 1-3, 9, LIPSIIUS – BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum*, vol. 2.1, pp. 128-133, 149-150; cf. FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus*, vol. 1, pp. 669-687; *Passio Bartholomaei*, AASS, Aug. 5, cols. 34C-36A; the homilist's version of the passion mentions the beheading of Bartholomew (*decollari*). Some later manuscripts of this *passio* emend the story so that Bartholomew was flayed (*decoriari*), a standard feature in other legends about the apostle: *ad ultimum rex mandauit eum decollari*, Herwagen Homiliary, 6, PL 94, col. 491B; ROSE, *Ritual Memory*, pp. 82-84, 92-94, 110.

⁶¹ The Simon and Jude passion account, for example, presents the two magicians teaching a form of Manichaeism, *Passio Simonis et Iudae*, FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus*, vol. 1, pp. 608-636.

⁶² For instance, early in the Simon and Jude sermon, the saints miraculously prevent the two magicians from speaking. But right after, the two magicians become apparently a larger group and gain the ability to speak (saying, strangely, that they cannot talk). This all made perfect sense when separated and placed in their contexts in the *Virtutes*, but not in the sermon: *et iam amplius non poterant loqui propter uirtutem apostolorum ... et ait unus ex eis: non possum loqui*, Herwagen Homiliary, 4, PL 94, col. 489D; the Bartholomew sermon, like the Simon and Jude sermon, excises the passion and healings, in order to focus on a confrontation between the apostle and a pagan figure (the demon-god Astaroth), who is rendered speechless. Bartholomew, then, baptizes the people and ordains a bishop; Herwagen Homiliary, 6, PL 94, cols. 490C-490D; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 4, PL 94, col. 489D; cf. *quaerere eum omnes ut eos sanaret*, Herwagen Homiliary, 6, PL 94, cols. 490C, 491A-491B; *quaerere medicos qui sanarent eum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, PL 94, cols. 494D-495A.

together. Only in his novel endings does the Herwagen preacher attempt to present these two sermons as more than a series of extracts.⁶³

Blunt quotation, however, was not the Herwagen preacher's only means of fashioning sermons from his sources as, for instance, the Herwagen sermon for the feast of St. John the Evangelist (December 27) displays.⁶⁴ Just as he did in his homilies for Simon and Jude and Bartholomew, the preacher gathers his information about John from the *Virtutes apostolorum*. Indeed, the preacher apparently knew two different hagiographies for John, usually found in two different recensions of the *Virtutes*: the *Virtutes Iohannis* from the Bavarian group of manuscripts and the Pseudo-Mellitus passion from the Frankish group.⁶⁵

In this sermon, the homilist rewrites his source material in an adroit manner, often simplifying language, removing extraneous information, and

⁶³ *Et solemnitas passionis eorum celebratur V Calend. Novemb., et uiuunt in aeterna requie*, Herwagen Homiliary, 4, PL 94, col. 490A; *nos ita suscipiat Deus, qui uiuit et regnat*, Herwagen Homiliary, 6, PL 94, col. 491B.

⁶⁴ Herwagen Homiliary, 8, PL 94, cols. 494A-494D; a parallel to this Herwagen homily on St. John is extant in a West Frankish homiliary manuscript produced in the 870s (Lyon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 628, fols. 15v-17r). This long sermon contains a small section telling of John's assumption, using language akin to the Herwagen sermon. Wenger (who edited this section) suggested that the Lyons sermon may be the Herwagen preacher's source. However, since the differences between these two sermons are as apparent as their similarities, they are more likely independent compositions both based on the *Virtutes apostolorum*. Many medieval writers—for instance, Orderic Vitalis in the second book of his *Ecclesiastical History*—borrowed heavily on the *Virtutes*; Orderic Vitalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, 2.2.7-8, 11, 15, 17, 25, PL 188, cols. 128D-138D, 148A-154B, 165A-168A, 172A-177A, 203A-206C; M. DIESENBERGER, "Reworking the *Virtutes Apostolorum* in the Salzburg Sermon-Collection (1st Quarter of the Ninth Century)", *Apocrypha*, 23 (2012), pp. 47-64; A. WENGER, *L'Assomption de la T. S. Vierge dans la tradition byzantine du VIe au Xe siècle: études e documents*, Paris, 1955, p. 169.

⁶⁵ In general, the Bavarian-group manuscripts contain BHL 4316, and the Frankish-group BHL 4320. While the *Virtutes Iohannis* seemingly arose in the same milieu as the wider *Virtutes apostolorum* collection, the Pseudo-Mellitus passion was originally an independent sixth-century text with a separate history. The two texts overlap greatly in content and probably used a common earlier source. The Herwagen preacher borrowed elements unique to both traditions: for instance, the boiling oil from the Bavarian-group *Virtutes Iohannis* and John's assumption before an altar from Pseudo-Mellitus. The preacher seemingly knew a manuscript of the *Virtutes apostolorum* containing both texts or perhaps an amalgamation of the two. The best edition of the Pseudo-Mellitus *Passio Iohannis* remains Heine's, widely available in PG 5, cols. 1239-1350; cf. G. HEINE, *Bibliotheca Anecdotorum seu Veterum Monumentum ecclesiasticorum*, Leipzig, 1848, vol. 1, pp. 109-117; the Bavarian-group *Virtutes Iohannis* is in Fabricius' eighteenth-century edition as well as in *Virtutes Iohannis, Acta Iohannis*, vol. 2 – ed. E. JUNOD – J. D. KAESTLI, Turnhout, 1983 (CC SA, 2), pp. 799-834; for a lengthy discussion of the relationship between the *Virtutes Iohannis* and the *Passio Iohannis*, see JUNOD – KAESTLI, *Acta Iohannis*, pp. 750-795; ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Editorial Problems", pp. 16-17, 22-29; BHL 4316, 4320, 4322m.

altering dialogue into indirect discourse and vice versa.⁶⁶ While some of these changes may reflect unique readings in the preacher's manuscript of the *Virtutes*, others (such as the reworked dialogue) must be his own creations. In order to add his original ideas to the narrative, the Herwagen preacher happily disregards the *acta's* facts. For instance, he dramatically reinterprets one section from the *acta*, when John tells his followers that he retained his virginity because Christ called him to become a disciple on the day of John's wedding.⁶⁷ The Herwagen preacher combines this speech with the miracle of the water into wine (John 2:1-12), moves the tale to the beginning of the sermon, and creates a new version of the story of the wedding at Cana featuring John as the groom.

The Herwagen preacher sometimes appends lengthy introductions or conclusions to his borrowed narrative, as in his homily for the Feast of St. Peter and St. Paul on June 29.⁶⁸ Here too, the Herwagen preacher draws from the *Virtutes apostolorum* loosely.⁶⁹ He begins by quoting from a hymn

⁶⁶ Quotes of either text (at least, as represented by the Junod-Kaestli and *PG* editions) in this sermon are rare, but the Herwagen preacher supplies a few. For instance: *si uis ut credam in deum tuum, dabo tibi uenenum bibere, quod cum biberis, si mortuus non fueris, credam ... praecepit foueam fieri iuxta altare*, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, cols. 494B-494C; *Virtutes Iohannis*, c. 8, JUNOD – KAESTLI, p. 824; *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1347D, 1349C; the Herwagen preacher modifies the story about John's trial by ordeal before Aristodemus and assumption into heaven, following neither Pseudo-Mellitus nor the *Virtutes Iohannis* fully; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494A-494C; *Virtutes Iohannis*, cc. 1-2, 4, 8-9, JUNOD – KAESTLI, pp. 799-800, 803-814, 823-832; *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1347C-1250C.

⁶⁷ Although an unknown manuscript of the *Virtutes* may have already rewritten the story in this way, no currently-published evidence suggests that this plot change was anything other than the preacher's own creation. The treatment of his source material in other sermons (for instance, his *Visio Pauli* homilies) reveals a cleric willing to deviate. In sermon 18, the Herwagen preacher displays similar concerns about clerical marriage; Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494A; *Virtutes Iohannis*, c. 9, JUNOD – KAESTLI, pp. 830-831; *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1250A; the preacher also apparently thought that John had the vision which became the book of Revelation not while exiled at Patmos, but years before, at the last supper, when sleeping on Jesus' bosom (cf. John 13:23): *postea uero nocte illa, in qua fuit traditus, dormitauit beatus Ioannes in sinu illius, et uidit secreta coelestia, quae postea scripsit, et uocauit apocalypsim*, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494A; the introduction and conclusion of this homily are original, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, cols. 494A, 494D; the Herwagen homilies on Peter and Paul and on Laurence employ similar paraphrastic techniques in re-framing their source material.

⁶⁸ Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 495D-498A; *BHL* 6669d; S. F. JOHNSON, "Apocrypha and the Literary Past in Late Antiquity", in *From Rome to Constantinople: Studies in Honour of Averil Cameron* – ed. H. AMIRAV – B. H. ROMENY, Leuven, 2007, pp. 47-66.

⁶⁹ Despite its ostensible topic, the Herwagen preacher bases the body of the sermon on the *Acts of Peter*, from the *Virtutes apostolorum*. The text demonstrates no debt whatsoever to the *Acts of Paul* (though this text follows directly after Peter's in Bavarian-group manuscripts of the *Virtutes*). *Virtutes* manuscripts show greater diversity in their material for Peter and Paul than for any other apostle. For instance, in the Bavarian group, the two apostles have

for the feast: *Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines*, probably by Paulinus of Aquileia.⁷⁰ The sermon's introduction, then, provides a mystical interpretation of this hymn, expounding the meaning of various lines and exhorting the congregation to penance.⁷¹ Other sermons include similarly extended introductions.⁷² By utilizing several sources, the Peter and Paul sermon also deviates from the other three *Virtutes* sermons.⁷³ The homilist evidently

separate *uitae*, but in the Frankish group they have a single joint *uita*. The Herwagen preacher probably did not have access to the Bavarian-group *Acts of Paul* (as edited in Fabricius); *Virtutes Petri*, FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus*, vol. 1, pp. 402-441; Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 496B-497C; much of this text is also published in *Acta Petri*, AASS, Jun. 5, cols. 424E-428C; M. C. BALDWIN, *Whose Acts of Peter? Text and Historical Context of the Actus Vercellenses*, Tübingen, 2005, pp. 30-35, 41-42, 45-46, 73-74, 86, 111-112, 126-127; ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Editorial Problems", pp. 16-17, 22-29; BHL 6644, 6655, 6657.

⁷⁰ The sermon quotes only from the first two stanzas, but refers indirectly to other parts of the hymn—such as the keys of heaven in stanza three and the binding and loosening in stanza five; Paulinus of Aquileia, *Carmina*, 5 – ed. E. Dümmler, Berlin, 1881 (*MGH Poetae*, 1), p. 136; Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 495D-496B; I. B. MILFULL, *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the "Durham Hymnal"*, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 28, 46, 53, 452-455; since *Virtutes apostolorum* manuscripts often contain liturgical material, he may have known Paulinus' hymn from the same codex; ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Origin", pp. 135-150.

⁷¹ In addition to this hymn and the Bible, the Herwagen preacher quotes "Augustine" in this introduction: *sanctus Augustinus "exueret deus in tetra caligine mundum, doctrinae ascendit lumen apostolicae,"* Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, col. 496A; this quote is actually from Prosper of Aquitaine's versification of Augustine's *dicta*, a common grammatical school text in the early Middle Ages; Prosper of Aquitaine, *Liber epigrammatum*, 8, *PL* 51, col. 501B; the homily's original conclusion quotes from a homily by Gregory the Great for the Saturday after Easter. Since this section of Gregory was often quoted, the preacher may not have known it directly: *prodest interesse festis hominum, si deesse contingat festis angelorum*, Gregory I, *Hom.*, 2.26.10 – ed. R. ÉTAIX, Turnhout, 1999 (*CC SL*, 141), p. 226; Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 497D-498A.

⁷² The Laurence homily, for instance, begins with an original introduction expositing a common liturgical text (in this case, Ps. 34:11/33:12, used at the opening of the Maundy Thursday reconciliation rite) and concludes with an exhortation to follow the martyr's example. In this introduction, the preacher shows an interest in numerical lists (e.g., three arts of Satan, three theological virtues, two types of love), a style that also appears in the Ezekiel homily. This compositional method is reminiscent of the preacher's homily on Peter and Paul; Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491B-491D, 493D; for a language parallel between these two sermons, cf. *sed nihil hoc nobis proficit si inde exemplum bene uiuendi non accipimus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 493D; *parum nobis prodest si exemplum Domino uiuendi ab eis non sumimus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, col. 497D; Ratherius of Verona's homily for the Feast of Sts. Firmus and Rusticus, on August 9, also begins with this psalter quotation. Note the similarity in date to the Feast of St. Lawrence; Ratherius of Verona, *Sermo in Festo Firmi et Rustici*, *PL* 136, cols. 763B-766B.

⁷³ The Herwagen preacher adapts from *Virtutes Petri*, cc. 6, 16-20, FABRICIUS, *Codex apocryphus*, vol. 1, pp. 411-413, 430-441. The preacher's narrative, however, is confused and the order of events differs from all surviving versions of the *Acts of Peter*. In the middle of Pe-

grafts elements drawn from the Pseudo-Marcellus *Acts of Peter and Paul* to his narrative out of the *Virtutes Petri*.⁷⁴ The Herwagen preacher evidently knew a manuscript of the *Virtutes apostolorum* which contained the Pseudo-Marcellus *acta* (there are multiple examples of such codices).⁷⁵ This amalgamation results in considerable unevenness but allows the sermon to match the Feast of Peter and Paul better than a homily based solely on the *Virtutes Petri* would.⁷⁶

ter's confrontation with Simon Magus, the preacher suddenly shifts so that Peter and Paul, rather than just Peter alone, are present. The emplotment follows a strange pattern: Peter's confrontation with Simon Magus in Samaria (Acts 8:9-24), Peter's confrontation with Simon Magus before Nero in Rome, the *Quo uadis* episode, Peter and Paul's confrontation with Simon Magus before Nero in Rome, the condemnation of Peter and Paul, Peter's crucifixion, Marcellus burying Peter's body, the death of Nero. This order is unparalleled as far as I know. Fabricius' version of the *Virtutes Petri*, for instance, never depicts Paul, places the whole confrontation with Simon before the *Quo uadis* episode, and has the prefect Agrippa (rather than Nero) condemn Peter. The Pseudo-Marcellus *acta*, in comparison, focuses more on Paul than on Peter, never discusses Simon's attempt to buy miraculous power in Samaria, and presents Peter telling of the *Quo uadis* episode while on the cross. For the *Acts of Peter* tradition, see BALDWIN, *Whose Acts of Peter*; LIPSIVS – BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum*, vol. 2. For the Simon Magus tradition, see A. FERREIRO, *Simon Magus in Patristic, Medieval, and Early Modern Traditions*, Leiden, 2005.

⁷⁴ Pseudo-Marcellus' text, originally in Greek but quickly translated, dates between 450 and 550 and appears in numerous early medieval manuscripts, including Frankish-group manuscripts of the *Virtutes*; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 10, PL 94, cols. 497A-497D; *Acta Petri et Pauli*, cc. 49-65, LIPSIVS – BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum*, vol. 2.1, pp. 161-175; BALDWIN, *Whose Acts of Peter*, pp. 40-46, 72-74.

⁷⁵ The preacher himself may have mixed from Pseudo-Marcellus and the Bavarian-group *Virtutes* text (such as the one edited by Fabricius), or these two hagiographies already may have been merged in his manuscript. However, since the Herwagen preacher is aware not only Fabricius' texts of Peter (BHL 6663) and John (BHL 4316), but also of Pseudo-Marcellus (BHL 6657) and Pseudo-Mellitus (BHL 4320), and not of Fabricius' Acts of Paul (BHL 6575), he likely used a manuscript of the Frankish recension of the *Virtutes*, rather than the Bavarian recension—perhaps one similar to Paris, Ste. Geneviève 557; ROSE, "Virtutes Apostolorum: Editorial Problems", pp. 24-28.

⁷⁶ The Herwagen preacher depends on Pseudo-Marcellus, as a few quotes demonstrate: *prius erat electus quam ego ... Simon turrim ascendit magnam omni populo uidente ... gratias nunc reddo tibi qui es pastor omnium animarum christianarum; oues quas mihi tradidisti ... et fugit in insulas ubi mortuus fame et frigore et a lupis et leonibus comestus est*, Herwagen Homiliary, 10, PL 94, cols. 497A-497D; *tu prior electus es ... ascendit Simon in turrim coram omnibus ... gratias tibi ago bone pastor quia oues quas mihi credidisti ... in siluis dum erraret fugiens frigore nimio et fame diriguisse et a lupis esse deuoratum*, *Acta Petri et Pauli*, cc. 52, 54, 62, 65, LIPSIVS – BONNET, *Acta Apostolorum*, vol. 2.1, pp. 163, 165, 173, 175; the Herwagen preacher intertwines elements from both Fabricius' *Virtutes Petri* and Pseudo-Marcellus when the two texts cover the same information. For instance, although most of the sermon's end stems from Pseudo-Marcellus, the homilist's description of Marcellus himself (ironically) is from Fabricius' text. (Marcellus is described as anointing the body with fragrant oils and burying it in a tomb, rather than hiding it under a terebinth tree.) The *Quo uadis* episode

Besides the *Virtutes apostolorum*, the only other source influencing multiple sermons by the Herwagen Preacher is the *Visio Pauli*, the legend of the Apostle Paul's vision of heaven and hell.⁷⁷ The *Visio Pauli* is the Latin version of the *Apocalypse of Paul*: the most influential apocryphal apocalyptic text to come out of Late Antique Christianity.⁷⁸ The originally Greek *Apocalypse* was translated into Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Slavonic.⁷⁹ The *Visio* survives in at least eleven separate Latin redactions from the Middle Ages, as well as versions in numerous medieval vernaculars.⁸⁰

includes details (e.g., that it occurred when Peter arrived at the gate of Rome) that are in Fabricius, but not in Pseudo-Marcellus.

⁷⁷ Herwagen Homiliary, 16, *PL* 94, cols. 501A-502D; the Herwagen preacher adapts redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli*, edited in H. BRANDES, *Visio S. Pauli: Ein Beitrag zur Visionsliteratur, mit einem deutschen und zwei lateinischen Texten*, Halle, 1885, pp. 75-80; Brandes published his text from three high medieval manuscripts (Vienna, ÖNB, 876; London, BL, Additional 26770; London, BL, Harley 2851). Another edition is in F. MEYER, "La descente de Saint-Paul en enfer", *Romania*, 24 (1895), pp. 365-375; a translation of the Irish text of redaction IV appears in *Irish Biblical Apocrypha: Selected Texts in Translation* – ed. M. HERBERT – M. McNAMARA, Edinburgh, 1989, pp. 132-136, 185; the *Visio Pauli* takes its inspiration from Paul's reference to a heavenly vision in 2 Cor. 12:1-7.

⁷⁸ For basic scholarship on the Latin *Visio Pauli*, including editions of other redactions, see M. R. JAMES, *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments*, Cambridge, 1893, pp. 1-42, 111-112, 186-192; BRANDES, *Visio S. Pauli*, pp. 68-71, 95-96; T. SILVERSTEIN – A. HILHORST, *Apocalypse of Paul: A New Critical Edition of Three Long Latin Versions*, Geneva, 1997, pp. 66-162, 170-193; T. SILVERSTEIN, *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin, Together with Nine Texts*, London, 1935, pp. 10-11, 52-56, 131-152; C. CAROZZI, *Eschatologie et au-delà: Recherches sur l'Apocalypse de Paul*, Aix-en-Provence, 1994, pp. 179-265, 277-290; R. P. CASEY, "The Apocalypse of Paul", *Journal of Theological Studies*, 34 (1933), pp. 1-32; M. E. DWYER, "An Unstudied Redaction of the *Visio Pauli*", *Manuscripta*, 32 (1988), pp. 121-138; R. BAUCKHAM, *The Fate of the Dead: Studies on the Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*, Leiden, 1998, pp. 304-331; L. JIROUŠKOVÁ, *Die Visio Pauli: Wege und Wandlungen einer orientalischen Apokryphe im lateinischen Mittelalter unter Einschluss der altschleischischen und deutschsprachigen Textzeugen*, Turnhout, 2006, pp. 5-6, 185-188, 651; and the essays in *The Visio Pauli and the Gnostic Apocalypse of Paul* – ed. J. N. BREMMER – I. CZACHESZ, Leuven, 2007.

⁷⁹ Although earlier short versions of the *Visio* may already have existed in the third century, the longer composite recension dates between 395 and 416. A Latin translation was made in the fifth century. Authors like Caesarius of Arles and the *Magister* (of the *Rule of the Master*) already quote it as authoritative. Since all the surviving Greek versions are late and fragmentary, the best witness to the original form of the Greek *Apocalypse of Paul* is the Latin translation in Paris, B.N., Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1631, fols. 3-25. The Paris manuscript was copied in the late eighth century or early ninth century by a monk named Gauzlinus at the Abbey of Fleury.

⁸⁰ For early medieval vernacular translations, see, P. HEALEY, *The Old English Vision of St. Paul*, Cambridge, MA, 1978, pp. 3-4, 10, 19-21, 26-28, 31; M. McNAMARA, *The Apocrypha in the Irish Church*, Dublin, 1975, pp. 105-109; C. D. WRIGHT, *The Irish Tradition in Old English Literature*, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 106-174; J. E. C. WILLIAMS, "Irish Translations of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*", *Éigse*, 6 (1960), pp. 127-134.

The sixteenth Herwagen homily is a straightforward copy of redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli*, an abbreviated adaption of the work and the most widely circulated of all the redactions.⁸¹ Since redaction IV already has a sermonic style, the preacher made few changes to the text, merely removing a few clauses and changing some diction.⁸² These touch-ups render the text better suited to preaching, rather than reading.

The narrative warns lay people to avoid certain sins by telling of the terrible punishments sinners receive in hell for their deeds, so it matches (indeed, shapes) the penitential tone of the second half of the Herwagen collection.⁸³ The sermon may have served as a *Quando Volueris*, adaptable for a variety of penitential seasons like Lent or Advent.⁸⁴ However, since the *Visio Pauli* sermon comes directly before a homily for Michaelmas (29 September) and features Michael the Archangel as a central character, this sermon may also be for Michaelmas.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Redaction IV probably originated in an area of Anglo-Saxon England under Celtic influence by the eleventh century at the latest. According to one count, of the fifty-two medieval manuscripts which contain some redaction of the *Visio Pauli*, twenty-one are English. While most redactions survive in only a single manuscript, redaction IV is in twenty-seven. No extant manuscript of redaction IV survives before the twelfth century, so the lost Herwagen codex may have pre-dated all extant manuscripts. (Redaction VI and XI, both Irish, are the only versions to survive in manuscript before 1000.) One of the twelfth-century Lambeth homilies, however, draws on IV, and the later redactions V, VIII, and X all derive from redaction IV. Thus, redaction IV must date to the eleventh century or earlier; T. SILVERSTEIN, "The Vision of St. Paul: New Links and Patterns in the Western Tradition", *Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du moyen âge*, 34 (1959), pp. 220-224, 244-248; WRIGHT, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 106-174; SILVERSTEIN, *Visio Sancti Pauli*, pp. 6-14, 52-56.

⁸² The *Visio* has a sermonic opening and closing: *dies dominicus, dies electus est, in quo gaudent angeli. Interrogandum est quis primus rogauit ut animae haberent requiem in inferno, et respondendum est quia Paulus apostolus et Michael archangelus rogauerunt dominum, quando ex inferno exierunt ... nos autem, fratres charissimi, audientes tanta tormenta inferni, conuertamur ad dominum nostrum, ut cum angelis eius ualeamus regnare*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, PL 94, cols. 501A, 502D; small differences exist between the Herwagen text and the one Brandes printed. The preacher evidently rewrote the text slightly. For instance, cf.: *dies dominicus, dies electus est, in quo gaudent angeli et archangeli maior diebus ceteris. Interrogandum est quis primus rogauit ut animae habeant requiem in penis inferni. Id est beatus Paulus apostolus et Michabel archangelus, quando iuerent ad infernum*, BRANDES, *Visio S. Pauli*, p. 75.

⁸³ Although the original version of *Visio* devoted just as much time to Paul's journey to heaven as to hell, redaction IV focuses on the hell portion, indulging in lurid descriptions of the torments of sinners.

⁸⁴ The sermon warns repeatedly about the need to do penance: *et in ipsa fornace ponebantur animae peccatorum quae non egerunt poenitentiam in hoc saeculo ... qui non sunt reuersi ad poenitentiam ... nec poenitentiam accepistis, sed iniqui fuistis*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, PL 94, cols. 501B-501C, 502C.

⁸⁵ Blicking Homily 16, an Old English sermon written in the middle of the tenth century, is for Michaelmas and borrows on the *Visio Pauli* as well as on the account of the apparition of Michael on Monte Gargano; R. F. JOHNSON, *Saint Michael the Archangel in Medieval*

Although the Herwagen preacher's use of the *Visio Pauli* in the sixteenth sermon is even more conservative than his use of the *Virtutes apostolorum* in the Simon and Jude or Bartholomew sermons, elsewhere he employs the *Visio* more creatively. One sermon, for instance, focuses on the popular medieval theme of the relationship between the body and the soul at death.⁸⁶ The body of the sermon relates a miracle story about Macarius the Younger of Alexandria, in which the saint speaks to the skull of a dead Jew who describes the horrors of hell and urges the living to say mass on behalf of the dead.⁸⁷ By the late ninth or early tenth century, various recensions of a letter allegedly by Macarius circulated, depicting the fate of the body and soul after death.⁸⁸ Although the precise source for the Herwagen sermon remains elusive, the preacher evidently knew some version of the Macarian text.⁸⁹ But the preacher evidently rewrote the Macarius *exemplum*

English Legend, Woodbridge, UK, 2005, pp. 23-26, 53-55, 60, 95-99, 132; WRIGHT, *Irish Tradition*, pp. 122-132.

⁸⁶ This was a popular theme in the early Middle Ages, especially in the British Isles. Texts often feature a debate between the body and the soul after the death of a human; Herwagen Homiliary, 14, *PL* 94, col. 499D; see D. MOFFAT, *The Old English Soul and Body*, Woodbridge, UK, 1990; L. DUDLEY, *The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul*, Baltimore, 1911; the Herwagen sermon begins by quoting Job 14:1, used in the Office for the Dead. This concern with death suggests All Souls' Day or Lent as suitable occasions for the sermon. All Souls' Day appeared ca. 1000 and spread slowly across Latin Europe in the eleventh and twelfth century (particularly due to Cluniac influence). The sermon could be one of the first homilies for this feast or perhaps just a Lenten homily; M. E. H. MOORE, "Demons and the Battle for Souls at Cluny", *Studies in Religion*, 32:4 (2003), pp. 485-497.

⁸⁷ After walking into a deserted Jewish cemetery, Macarius revives a skull by touching it with his crosier. The skull demands to know why Macarius disturbed it (*quid me uoluis*), and the saint asks it what happens to dead Jews. The Jewish skull then explains that Jewish and bad Christians suffer alike a variety of torments in hell and that the celebration of masses brings temporary relief from suffering for both groups; Herwagen Homiliary, 14, *PL* 94, col. 500A; Macarius the Younger's feast day is January 2; B. BLUMENKRANZ, *Auteurs chrétiens latins du moyen âge sur les juifs et le judaïsme*, Paris, 1963, p. 137.

⁸⁸ For such texts, see J. LECLERCQ, "Deux anciennes versions de la légende de l'Abbé Macaire", *Revue Mabillon* 36 (1946), pp. 65-79; cf. Pseudo-Augustine, *Serm. ad fratres in eremo*, 69, *PL* 40, cols. 1355-1357; MACHIELSEN, *CPPMA*, IA, no. 1196, p. 260; T. BATIOUCHKOF, "Le Débat de l'Âme et du Corps", *Romania*, 20 (1891), pp. 576-578; C. D. WRIGHT, "The Old English 'Macarius' Soul-and-Body Homily, Vercelli Homily IV, and Ephraem the Syrian's *De paenitentia*", in *Via Crucis: Studies in Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross* – ed. T. N. HALL, Morgantown, 2001, pp. 210-234.

⁸⁹ The preacher must have found the story of Macarius and the skull in a source, rather than inventing it himself, for the story stands in obvious tension with the rest of the homily. The hagiographic story suggests that Christians should say masses for Jews as well as Christians (*nos et multae animae Christianorum*), yet the homilist concludes by recommending masses only for dead Christians (*pro animabus omnium fidelium defunctorum*). Blumenkranz notes that the ending of the sermon contradicts the implicit moral of the exemplar about Macari-

in light of redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli*, from which he borrows both language and imagery.⁹⁰ According to both the sermon and the *Visio Pauli*, after leaving the deceased body, the soul either meets angelic psychopomps or is bound by demons and taken to hell (depending on its deeds).⁹¹ And both texts emphasize that the sufferers in hell receive a temporary respite from their torments during Sunday mass.⁹² Regardless, then, of where the preacher found the yarn about Macarius, the main source for the homily is not this story at all, but redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli*.

Finally, the *Visio Pauli* influences a sermon on penance near the end of the homiliary. The Herwagen preacher assembled this sermon out of parts of two Carolingian homilies.⁹³ While the preacher keeps fairly close to

us. The Herwagen homilist had not internalized the message of the original source; Herwagen Homiliary, 14, PL 94, cols. 500A-500B; BLUMENKRANZ, *Auteurs chrétiens*, pp. 135-137.

⁹⁰ The Jewish skull, for instance, describes hell as containing a well as deep as the distance between heaven and earth, filled with sinful souls and snakes: *puteus est mirae profunditatis, quantum est a terra usque ad coelum, et in puteo est aqua frigida super omne frigus, et ignis calidior cunctis ignibus, et fetor intolerabilis, fames et sitis, et serpentes, et inter dolores istos stamus et cruciamur nos et multae animae Christianorum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 14, PL 94, cols. 500A-500B; *prima nix, secunda glacies, tertia ignis, quarta sanguis, quinta serpentes, sexta fulgur, septima fetor ... puteum signatum septem foribus, et dixit eis: sta longius, ut possis sustinere fetorem; et aperuit os putei, et surrexit fetor magnus superans omnes poenas ... Et uidit in alio loco uiros ac mulieres, uermes ac serpentes ... profunditasque illius loci, quasi exaltantur coeli a terra*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, PL 94, cols. 501B, 501D-502A. In the *Visio Pauli*, this well is full of non-Christians (those who do not believe in the incarnation, who are not baptized, who do not take communion). In the soul-and-body sermon, the skull states that Jews and Christians suffer alike.

⁹¹ As is standard in medieval body-soul texts, both the sermon and the *Visio Pauli* conceive of the disembodied soul as physical, so that Michael can stand in front of the soul and the soul can be caught in demonic nets and cast into wells. The sermon specifies Michael and the Devil as the two guides of the soul after death, but the *Visio* just speaks of angels and demons in general: *anima ... cum exit de corpore ... uidet ante se sanctum Michaellem ... Vae illis animabus quas diabolus suscipit et ligat sub laqueo*, Herwagen Homiliary, 14, PL 94, col. 499D; *uidit inter coelum et terram animam peccatoris, ululantem inter septem diabolos, ducentes eam eo die exeuntem de corpore ... Vae tibi, misera anima ... deduxerunt animam angeli de corpore ad coelum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, PL 94, cols. 502A-502B.

⁹² *Et ait sanctus Macharius: dic mihi si habetis ullam requiem. Respondit caput: quandiu tu siue alter ita bonus missas pro mortuis dicis, quantum durat missa, tantum sumus in requie*, Herwagen Homiliary, 14, PL 94, col. 500A; *Dies dominicus, dies electus est, in quo gaudent angeli. Interrogandum est quis primus rogauit ut animae haberent requiem in inferno, et respondendum est ... requiem ab hora nona sabbati usque ad horam primam feriae secundae*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, PL 94, cols. 501A, 502C; note the question and answer format of both sections. Admittedly, these rests differ in duration, as the skull states that rest occurs anytime mass is said (not just on Sunday), while the *Visio Pauli* views the rest as all Sunday, not just during mass.

⁹³ Herwagen Homiliary, 19, PL 94, cols. 503B-504B; the body of the sermon comes from a homily on penance by Hrabanus Maurus. Hrabanus himself was adapting from an earlier

his sources when using them, he also inserts a lengthy original digression about the glories of heaven and horrors of hell, modifying elements from the *Visio Pauli*.⁹⁴ The following sermon, on doomsday, picks up where the penance homily ends; it expounds various sins and warns the congregation to repent because final judgment can come at any moment.⁹⁵ Each of these two sermons operates as a *memento mori*, pressing Christians to do penance immediately because they cannot know when they will die.⁹⁶

penitential homily of Caesarius of Arles, which Caesarius himself stitched together out of sections from Augustine; cf. Caesarius, *Serm.*, 18.2-6 – ed. G. MORIN, Turnhout, 1953 (*CC SL*, 103), pp. 83-66. Although he only uses the first half of Hrabanus' sermon, the Herwagen preacher stays closer to Hrabanus' text. He does change some minor syntax and removes a few clauses; Hrabanus Maurus, *Hom. ad Haistulfum*, 56, *PL* 110, cols. 104B-105A; Herwagen Homiliary, 19, *PL* 94, cols. 503C-504A; the Herwagen preacher, however, adapted the opening and the conclusion from an anonymous Carolingian sermon, falsely ascribed to Augustine (Pseudo-Augustine, *Serm. ad fratres in eremo* 66, *PL* 40, cols. 1352-1353). Although the provenance of this sermon is unclear, it survives in numerous continental manuscripts from the ninth century forward. This Carolingian sermon itself extracts from some of Caesarius' sermons, just like Hrabanus' text. The Herwagen homily then has a Caesarian tone throughout; Herwagen Homiliary, 19, *PL* 94, cols. 503B-503B, 504A-504B; cf. Caesarius, *Serm.*, 31.1-3, 198.1, MORIN, pp. 1.134-136, 2.799; MACHIELSEN, *CPPMA*, IA, no. 1193, p. 259; P. VERBRAGEN, "Le Recueil Augustinien de Schäftlarn", *Revue bénédictine*, 82 (1972), p. 50.

⁹⁴ For language from the *Visio*: *parata sunt in inferno, ubi est fletus, et stridor dentium, ubi flamma, pediculi et ranae, et uermes non moriuntur. Ignis qui ibi est non exstinguitur; ibi sunt tenebrae et mala, nulla lux ibi est, nulla consolatio; ibi est fetor quem nullus sustinere potest*, Herwagen Homiliary, 19, *PL* 94, col. 504A.

⁹⁵ *Videte ut semper pauidi et solliciti expectetis iudicis aduentum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 20, *PL* 94, col. 504C; both sermons employ many of the same rhetorical phrases, such as clauses beginning with *uae* or *ubi*. Both also contain similar discussions on heaven and hell. Most of the second sermon is a rewritten version of the parable of the separation of the sheep and the goats, from Matt. 25:31-46, but the preacher also alludes to the parable of the ten virgins, directly before the sheep and goats passage in the same chapter: *Vae illis quos inueniet dormientes in peccatis*, Herwagen Homiliary, 20, *PL* 94, col. 504D; although the scene is right out of the gospel account, the preacher depicts God separating the righteous from the wicked based on vague virtues and vices rather than on specific corporate acts of mercy (e.g., feeding the hungry, visiting prisoners): *pro misericordia, pro fide, et pietate et ueritate, et caetera ... pro iniquitate et malignitate uestra*, Herwagen Homiliary, 20, *PL* 94, cols. 504D-505A.

⁹⁶ In the second sermon, the preacher lists vices along with biblical proof-texts condemning them, excerpted from Pirmin's *Scarapsus*. Consider, for instance: *in mendacio est magnum crimen, sicut ait Salomon: os quod mentitur, occidit animam ... et cupiditas, unde dicit apostolus: radix omnium malorum est cupiditas... et inuidia ... diabolus primum hominem decepit, sicut scriptum est: per inuidiam crucifixus est Christus; et ideo qui inuidet proximo, Christum crucifigit*, Herwagen Homiliary, 20, *PL* 94, col. 504C; *de cupiditate autem dicit ... per apostolum: radix omnium malorum est cupiditas ... omne quod mendacium est, peccatum est: os quod mentitur occidit animam ... quia scriptum est: inuidia diaboli mors introiuit in orbem terrarum. Et quia per inuidiam crucifixus est Christus; et ideo qui inuidiam habet proximo suo, crucifigit Christum*, Pirminius, *Scarapsus*, cc. 14, 18, in *Der heilige Pirmin und sein Pastoralbüchlein* –

The Herwagen preacher's distinctive homiletic style, therefore, appears throughout, shaping everything from syntax and diction to content, compositional style, and source usage. The many commonalities running across these sermons imply that the preacher envisioned these seventeen sermons as a deliberate collection, rather than a random assortment of speeches.

5. *Ancient Saints in a Medieval World*

Although the Herwagen preacher sets most of his sermons in pagan or early Christian Rome, the contemporary medieval world of his congregation infuses his narratives. The Herwagen preacher often refashions his source material to craft simpler, direct language, eliminating dialogue and rhetorical devices; he anticipated a relatively unlearned audience, which included lay people.⁹⁷ His moral exhortations frequently include uniquely lay concerns—such as adultery, almsgiving, and childbirth.⁹⁸ Pamelius recognized this emphasis, as he rubricated the fourteenth sermon in the hom-

ed. U. Engelmann, Sigmaringen, 1976, pp. 38, 48-50; other phrases in this section derive directly from the Bible (e.g. *iracundia uiri iustitiam Dei non operatur* from Jam. 1:20 and *ponere orbem terrae desertum et peccatores* from a *Vetus Latina* reading for Isa. 13:9).

⁹⁷ Admittedly, the preacher may not have delivered these sermons in Latin. More likely, the Latin texts are sermon notes which the preacher extemporaneously translated. For such simplified language, compare, for instance: *sedeas cum fratribus tuis ad mensam*, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494C; *epuleris in conuiuio meo cum fratribus tuis*, *Virtutes Iohannis*, c. 9, JUNOD – KAESTLI, p. 827; cf. *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1250A; the Herwagen preacher even feels obligated to explain to his audience that a *natalis* is the day of a saint's death, not birth. A clerical or monastic audience would know this already. Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494A.

⁹⁸ In the Laurence homily, he advises his congregation about confessing to a priest: *nam de illis peccatis quae in mente non inueniuntur hominis, nullus sacerdos eum potest absoluere, nisi ipse confiteatur ea*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 491C; in one of his penitential sermons, the Herwagen preacher addresses a group that includes lay people, for he speaks of them marrying, bearing children, and buying land: *uillam emis, bonam desideras. Vxorem uis ducere, bonam quaeris. Filios tuos uis nasci bonos*, Herwagen Homiliary, 19, *PL* 94, col. 503C; this lay focus is particularly clear in the Herwagen preacher's rewritten version of the *Visio Pauli*. The cleric condemns a long list of sins, mostly aimed at the laity, including fornication, adultery, not doing penance, not listening in church, usury, infanticide, fast-breaking, not seeking baptism, and not communicating. Indeed, the preacher changes the one explicitly clerical sinner in the *Visio* (an unchaste bishop) into a generic greedy old man: *et uidit in alio loco senem ... hic est negligens, qui non custodit legem dei, sed auarus fuit et dolosus et superbus ... Paule, cur fles super humanum genus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 16, *PL* 94, col. 501D; *et uidit in alio loco unum senem ... episcopus negligens fuit. Non custodiuit legem dei, non fuit castus de corpore uel de uerbo nec cogitatione nec opere, sed fuit auarus et dolosus atque superbus ... quare ploras Paule*, BRANDES, *Visio S. Pauli*, pp. 77.

iliary simply “to the laity” (*ad populum*).⁹⁹ Likewise, the Herwagen sermon on St. John portrays the apostle, before his assumption, preaching and celebrating the Eucharist on Sunday before a mixed group of clergy and laity.¹⁰⁰ In the Herwagen sermon, therefore, John’s assumption occurs after a church service, just like the one which the Herwagen preacher himself was then leading.

Moreover, a stamp of the Herwagen preacher’s style is his penchant for combining multiple characters from a source-text into one and for changing their official titles.¹⁰¹ The seventh Herwagen homily, for the Feast of St. Laurence on August 10, is a good example.¹⁰² The preacher relates the

⁹⁹ This title grew out of the end of the sermon, where the preacher urges his audience to fast, give alms, and pray for the dead: *oremus dominum nostrum Iesum Christum pro animabus omnium fidelium defunctorum, cum missis et psalmis, et orationibus, ieiuniis et elemosynis ut dimittat eis omnia peccata sua per suam misericordiam*, Herwagen Homiliary, 14, *PL* 94, col. 500A.

¹⁰⁰ *Dominica die ... beatus Ioannes aduocauit christianos qui erant ibi, scilicet clericos ac laicos, et sacrificauit corpus et sanguinem domini, et dedit eis, rogans ut permanerent in fide quam promiserant*, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494C; both the Bavarian-group *Virtutes Iohannis* and the Pseudo-Mellitus *Passio Iohannis* are less specific about this service, merely referring to a vague *multitudo* and never explicitly mentioning John’s preaching or the Eucharist. The Herwagen preacher also tells of John approaching a church altar, a detail not in *Virtutes Iohannis*, but in Pseudo-Mellitus; *Virtutes Iohannis*, c. 9, JUNOD – KAESTLI, pp. 827-832; *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1249C-1250C; the *Virtutes Iohannis* depicts John praying over some bread, but does not clarify if this is the Lord’s Supper or just blessed bread, unlike the Herwagen preacher. In the *Virtutes*, John claims that by receiving the bread, the multitude acquires part of him (*pars mea*). The bread, thus, represents the body of John, not of Christ. Indeed, later on, manna is found in the place of John’s assumed body.

¹⁰¹ In the Simon and Jude sermon, for instance, he confuses the duke of the Babylonians (*dux Badinomorum*) with the Babylonian king (*rex*) later in the sermon, although the original *acta* portrays these two as different figures. He also conflates the magicians (*magi*) and the priests (*pontifices*); Herwagen Homiliary, 4, *PL* 94, cols. 489C-490A; in the John sermon, the preacher merges the emperor Domitian with a proconsul in Ephesus and makes Drusiana into a widow, although the *acta* depicts her as the wife of the Roman procurator Andronicus. Presumably, the preacher associated Drusiana with a widow mentioned later in the *Virtutes* (a different figure in the original) due to a misreading of *Virtutes Iohannis*, c. 7, JUNOD – KAESTLI, p. 820; *Passio Iohannis*, *PG* 5, cols. 1241C, 1245C; Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494B; in another place, the Herwagen preacher describes two criminals who are about to be executed along with John as *latrones*, although the *Virtutes* and the *Passio* are both less specific. This change strengthens the association between John and Christ (who died between two thieves); Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494B; in the Peter and Paul sermon, the preacher combines Emperor Nero with Agrippa the Prefect of Rome; Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 497B-497D.

¹⁰² Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491B-494A; *Passio Sixti*, *AASS*, Aug. 2, cols. 140D-141F; cf. Ado of Vienne, *Martyrologium*, 10 Aug., *PL* 123, cols. 322C-325C, 330A-331B; Ado is also the source of the life in *Vita Laurentii*, *AASS*, Aug. 2, cols. 518D-519F; cf. Notker of St. Gall, *Martyrologium*, *PL* 131, cols. 1136B-1138A; Marianus Scottus, *Chronicon*, 3.7, anno 263 – ed. G. WAITZ, Hanover, 1844 (*MGH SS*, 5), pp. 518-

story of Laurence's death, borrowing on a well-known Late Antique hagiographical text: the *Passio Polychronii*.¹⁰³ This extended passion account from the late fifth or early sixth century portrays the deaths of multiple Roman martyrs: not only Laurence but also Pope Sixtus II, Hippolytus, and others. The preacher alters almost all the characters' titles.¹⁰⁴ Laurence is transformed from one of the seven Roman archdeacons (*archidiaconus*) to the bearer of the keys of the church treasury (*clauiger*).¹⁰⁵ Likewise,

519; *BHL* 6884; Sixtus, an important figure in the homily, was Laurence's bishop and died three days earlier. Hippolytus, the jailor whom Laurence supposedly converted, died soon after the saint. The Herwagen preacher constructs his sermon out of the text of the second half of the passion account; *Passio Polychronii*, cc. 11-29 – ed. H. DELEHAYE, "Recherches sur le légendier romain", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 51 (1933), pp. 80-93; Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491D-493D.

¹⁰³ The *Passio Polychronii* was well-known during the early Middle Ages; see DELEHAYE, "Recherches", pp. 34-98. Parts of the *Passio Polychronii* were published as separate hagiographies in the *Acta Sanctorum*. See, for instance, *Passio Sixti*, *AASS*, Aug. 2, cols. 140F-141F; cf. Ado of Vienne, *Martyrologium*, 10 Aug., *PL* 123, cols. 332C-325C; for current scholarship on the *Passio Polychronii*, Nigellus Wireker, *The Passion of St. Lawrence: Epigrams and Marginal Poems* – ed. J. ZIOLKOWSKI, Leiden, 1994, pp. 53-56, 61-62, 192, 206, 238-247; *Le Martyrologie d'Adon: ses deux familles, ses trois recensions: texte et commentaire* – ed. J. DUBOIS – G. RENAUD, Paris, 1984; J. BENNETT, *St. Laurence And The Holy Grail: The Story Of The Holy Grail Of Valencia*, San Francisco, 2004, pp. 104-122; C. HO, "Grilled for Love: St Lawrence and His Devotees", *Medieval Perspectives*, 19 (2004), pp. 133-155; the preacher also quotes from a hagiography of St. Dorothea, a Cappadocian martyr. He probably read her hagiography in a martyrological manuscript that also contained the *Passio Polychronii*: *quia ita inuenimus scriptum: maius peccatum est de dei misericordia desperare quam idolis sacrificare*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491D, 493D; *Passio Dorotheae*, 2.6, *AASS*, Feb. 1, col. 774C.

¹⁰⁴ In strange change, the preacher alters a vague beating into a specific form of torture: *et scorpionibus cedentes affligite*, *Passio Polychronii*, c. 25, DELEHAYE, "Recherches", p. 90; *et eum flagellare fortiter cum corrigiis minutis quae habebant mammazas in capitibus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 493C; the preacher's congregation would have had trouble understanding this phrase, but it means something like "they scourged him viciously with small leather thongs, which had metal balls on their tips." After Laurence converts Romanus, one of the emperor's soldiers, Romanus has a vision of an angel healing the beaten Laurence. The Herwagen preacher describes this vision in greater depth than the original *passio*, claiming that the angel cleansed Laurence's wounds with a *gausape* (a classicizing Latin word for a coarse towel): *et tergebat eum uno gausape*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 493C; other interesting words added by the preacher include *labrum* (basin), *adunare* (to unite), *appor-tare* (to convey), *tostus* (roasted), and *tostire* (to roast). These may indicate the influence of Romance on the preacher's Latin.

¹⁰⁵ This shift connects Laurence with St. Peter, the Christian key-bearer *par excellence*. The preacher does still state that Laurence was a deacon, though not an archdeacon, by calling him a *diaconus* and a *leuita*. Decius is called an *imperator* in the sermon, although the passion uses *caesar*, perhaps indicating that the preacher's audience would not have understood *caesar* as a title. Decius commands *ministri* in the sermon, the *senatus* in the original passion (he also orders *milites* in both); *Passio Polychronii*, c. 19, DELEHAYE, "Recherches",

two other deacons, Agapites and Fidelissimus/Felicissimus, are turned into priests (*sacerdotes*).

While such alterations may at times be mere stylistic license, the preacher sometimes was seeking to modernize the world of the hagiography to make it more accessible to his audience. For instance, Valerian, a prefect (*prae-fectus*) in the hagiography becomes a provost (*praepositus*), and Hippolytus, his deputy (*uicarius*), becomes an overseer (*uillicus*).¹⁰⁶ While the original Late Antique titles of these characters meant little to the preacher's audience, their new titles are high medieval and thus comprehensible. Unlike their original sources, the preacher's sermons are filled with *duces*, *milites*, and *saraceni*.¹⁰⁷

The preacher's own social world also impedes on his narrative of Rogationtide and the Roman Greater Litany. The homilist supplies adequate summaries of the creation of these two feasts, drawing on Gregory of

pp. 85-86; Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491D, 492C; the emperor's executioners are also called *ministri* in the Peter and Paul sermon, Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, col. 497B; the Laurence and the Peter and Paul sermons are closely related in language. Cf. *facere quod promiserat ... quia gloria domini sibi parata fuit*, Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 497B-497C; *si facis quod promittis ... quia mihi et tibi gloria paratur*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 492D-493A.

¹⁰⁶ The original hagiography accurately reflects Roman governmental practices. After Diocletian, the Roman Empire was divided into praetorian prefectures, which were subdivided into dioceses headed by a *uicarius*. The Herwagen preacher's *praepositus/uillicus* pairing, on the other hand, first appears in the eleventh century to describe kinds of bailiffs. See, for instance, *Chronicon S. Huberti Andaginensis*, 16-17 – ed. L. C. BETHMANN and W. WATTENBACH, Hanover, 1848 (*MGH SS*, 8), pp. 576-577; Henry III, *Diploma pro. S. Maximiano*, *PL* 151, col. 1116B; Goscelin of Canterbury, *Vita Yuonis*, 2.5, *PL* 155, col. 84C; Poppo of Metz, *Diplomata* 2, *PL* 155, col. 1654; later instances abound, but I have not located a Carolingian example of the pairing (both words separately were common enough).

¹⁰⁷ In his sermon on the Chains of St. Peter, for example, the Herwagen preacher shifts Quirinus from a Roman tribune (*tribunus*) to a duke (*dux*) and modernizes vocabulary like *struma* and *boia* into *gutturiosus* and *catena*; Herwagen Homiliary, 12, *PL* 94, cols. 498C-498D; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 4, *PL* 94, cols. 489C-490A; language associated with vassalage also appears in the Laurence sermon. The preacher contrasts a son (*filius*) with a serf (*seruus*) and a vassal (*homo*): *nequaquam appellat nos homines, uel seruos, sed suos filios*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 491B; in his sermon on the true cross, the preacher changes Constantine's enemies from Danubean *barbari* to *saraceni*, reflecting Christian conflicts with Muslims in his own time; Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495B; *Inuentio Crucis A*, cc. 1, 3-4, 7-15 – ed. S. BORGEHAMMER, *How the Holy Cross was Found: From Event to Medieval Legend*, Stockholm, 1991, pp. 255-258, 261-271; in his Ash Wednesday sermon, the preacher relates some folklore about how ancient knights (presumably Romans) ashed themselves in the week before battle: *antiqui milites cum debebant ire ad bellum, fortiter per septem dies equos suos pascabant leuibus cibis, ut plus currere possent. In capite septem dierum ponebant cineres super capita sua, ut deus omnipotens daret eis uictoriam*, Herwagen Homiliary, 15, *PL* 94, col. 500B; the source of this strange idea is unknown. Naturally, the preacher drew parallels with Lent as a battle against sin and the devil.

Tours. At times, however, he misunderstands Gregory's language.¹⁰⁸ The Herwagen preacher also alters Gregory's description of the Greater Litany's penitential procession, perhaps in order to mirror how the preacher's own community celebrated the rite.¹⁰⁹ Strikingly, the preacher presents a noticeably rural portrayal of the standard origin story for Rogationtide, concerning bishop Mamertus and the fast of the city of Vienne.¹¹⁰ Although Gregory of Tours framed the story as an urban crisis within a Late Antique Gallo-Roman city, the Herwagen sermon locates the events in the villages and castles of the medieval countryside.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁸ The homilist, for instance, misinterprets Gregory's statement that the huge snake in the Tiber was the size of a log (*magno dracone in modo trabis*) as meaning that the snake had been washed down from a tree (*quidquid in siluis serpentum et scorpionum erat*). Presumably due to a manuscript error, he has seventy people, rather than eighty, die of the inguinal plague during the procession. The homilist leaves out the extended sermon that Pope Gregory delivers in order to focus on the narrative; Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, cols. 499A-499C; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* 10.1, KRUSCH, pp. 477-478, 480-481; later, the preacher claims that Frankish Rogationtide was created long after (*post multum tempus*) the Roman Greater Litany, when in fact it preceded the Roman feast by over a hundred years, as Gregory of Tours notes; Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, col. 499C; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* 2.34, KRUSCH, pp. 83-84.

¹⁰⁹ The Herwagen sermon claims that the processions ended at St. Peter's Basilica rather than Santa Maria Maggiore (as they do in Gregory of Tours' text). Perhaps the homilist felt it was strange to end a procession at anything other than the most important shrine in the area. He also makes the fourth group on the procession the widows and the sixth the children, rather than vice versa. This may reflect his church's customs or perhaps a general concern about proper ordering by status. Everyone, rather than just the clerical choirs, sing the *Kyrie Eleison*. And the homilist specifies that all the processors were fasting on bread and water, although his source never mentions fasting. Again, these changes probably stem from his own community's norm; Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, col. 499B-499C; Gregory of Tours, *Historiae* 10.1, KRUSCH, pp. 480-481; the preacher also adds rhetorical flourish to his description of the inguinal plague: *et dominus cum uxore et filiis et omni familia iret dormitum, mane omnes ferebantur ad sepulturam; et insuper sagittae igneae descendebant de coelo, et percutiebant homines, et statim moriebantur ... erat ubique dolor et luctus, quia omni die et hora nihil aliud faciebant Romani, nisi mortuos sepeliebant*, Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, col. 499A-499B.

¹¹⁰ Frankish Rogationtide receives less attention and accuracy in the sermon than the Roman Greater Litany does. The preacher's interest in the city of Rome and Roman saints like Gregory the Great explains this imbalance.

¹¹¹ The homilist vastly overstates the problems threatening Vienne. A massive wildfire and murderous lions materialize without any justification in the original source. Gregory of Tours mentions no plague, has deers and wolves rather than lions and wolves, and claims a small fire burnt only one urban building, rather than the church and the whole city center as well as the villages and castles in the countryside. Gregory also never indicates that the animals or fire killed anyone, viewing them only as prodigies (*prodigiis*): *fuit magna mortalitas ... descendit ignis de coelo, et incendit ecclesiam, et medietatem ciuitatis: et mortalitas hominum ex una parte erat, ex altera ignis, qui incendebat omnes uillas et castella. Et leones et lupi intrabant uicos, et deuorabant homines*, Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, col. 499C; cf. Gregory of

Language and allusions are vital hints for both dating and locating the origin of the Herwagen Preacher and his congregation. Medieval terminology often occurs in the homiliary: for instance, in the sermon for the dawn of Christmas. Here, the preacher acknowledges that congregations celebrated three Christmas masses: at the eve (*nox*), the dawn (*crepusculum*), and the day (*clara dies*).¹¹² This tripartite terminology appears in various post-Carolingian liturgical texts as standard terms for the three Christmas masses.¹¹³ Likewise, twice in the *litania* sermon, the preacher insists that the celebration of these litanies (Rogationtide and the Roman Greater Litany) defends against sudden death (*a morte subitanea*) in the community for another year.¹¹⁴ The language of litanies defending against sudden death became common among writers on Rogationtide by the twelfth century, perhaps borrowing on a postcommunion prayer from *de mortalitate* masses.¹¹⁵ The Herwagen homily is the earliest appearance of this idea.

Tours, *Historiae* 2.34, KRUSCH, pp. 83-84; when the Herwagen preacher describes a *dominus cum uxore et filiis et omni familia*, he seems to envision a lord with his family and serfs, rather than a Roman *paterfamilias*.

¹¹² *Sed notandum est quod tres missae hodie celebrantur, prima in nocte, secunda in crepusculo, tertia in clara die*, Herwagen Homiliary, 11, PL 94, col. 498B; BARRÉ, *Les homéliaires*, pp. 50, 213, 246.; *crepusculum* normally means twilight, rather than dawn (*diluculum*, *aurora*) in Latin. Since it is derived from *creper* (dark), however, the preacher understood it to refer to any time of partial darkness.

¹¹³ Cf. *si autem duxerit missam celebrent matutinalem, quae in lucis crepusculo celebranda est*, *Regularis Concordia*, PL 137, cols. 487A-487B; *unde et haec eadem missa non in nocte, non in crepusculo, sed clara et plena die solemnitus cantari solet*, Gottfried of Admont, *Hom.*, 9, PL 174, cols. 661D-662A; *tres missae in diuerso cantantur tempore, prima media nocte, secunda in crepusculo, tertia in clara die*, *Liber Quare*, additio 17.b – ed. G. P. GÖTZ, Turnhout, 1983 (CC CM, 60), p. 144; Gottfried's text (perhaps actually by Gottfried's brother Irimbert) is a mid-twelfth-century homily for Christmas Day. The *Liber Quare* is an anonymous liturgical commentary which is variously dated, but the *additiones* supplementing the commentary are from the late eleventh century or twelfth century. The *Regularis Concordia* is an Anglo-Saxon monastic rule from the late tenth century. All these sections discuss the Christmas liturgy. Other phrases in the Herwagen sermons, such as *medietas ciuitatis* and *facere baptisterium*, also suggest a tenth- or eleventh-century date.

¹¹⁴ The preacher portrays Gregory the Great as guaranteeing the apotropaic effectiveness of the holiday. The two penitential seasons, pleading for divine mercy, had shifted into almost *ex opere operato* protective rites: *agere hunc diem dicens "quicumque hunc diem celebrauerit, non morietur in illo anno morte subitanea"...* *tres dies rogationum, ut omnis populus qui erat auxilium et misericordiam a deo peteret, et ut eos defenderet a morte subitanea*, Herwagen Homiliary, 13, PL 94, col. 499C.

¹¹⁵ *Ne perdidieris nos, domine, cum iniquitatibus nostris sed, tua sancta sumentes, a subitaneae mortis defende periculis*, *Corpus orationum*, 3550, ed. E. MOELLER et al., Turnhout, 1992 (CC SL, 160D), p. 252; this prayer appears in a number of eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts; cf. *letania interpretatur supplicatio uel rogatio. Supplicatio dicitur, quia tunc deo supplicamus, ut a morte subitanea et ab omni aduersitate nos defendat*, Jean Beleth, *De ecclesiasticis officiis*, 122b – ed. H. DOUTEIL, Turnhout, 1976 (CC CM, 41A), p. 233; Martin

Even more telling than language, however, are some of the allusions. In one text, for instance, the homilist mentions that the Apostle John's brother James is buried in Spain. Evidently, the Herwagen preacher taught after the shrine of Santiago de Compostela had become known throughout the West, implying a date in the late ninth century at the earliest, more likely the mid-tenth century or later.¹¹⁶ The Herwagen sermon for Ash Wednesday, similarly, assumes an advanced stage in the feast's development.¹¹⁷ The preacher demands that his entire congregation confess its sins and receive ashes on that day.¹¹⁸ Homiliaries, however, only regularly include Ash Wednesday homilies from the eleventh century.¹¹⁹ Moreover,

of León, *Serm.*, 29, *PL* 208, col. 1035C; Sicard of Cremona, *Mitralis de officiis*, 7.6 – ed. G. SARBAK – L. WEINBACH, Turnhout, 2008 (*CC CM*, 228), p. 571; Alexander of Hales, *Expositio in Apocalypsim*, 11 – ed. A. WACHTEL, Weimar, 1955 (*MGH QQ Geistesgesch.*, 1), p. 254.

¹¹⁶ *Iste est frater beati Iacobi, cuius in Hispania corpus requiescat*, Herwagen Homiliary, 8, *PL* 94, col. 494A; the legend that James the son of Zebedee preached in Spain dates from the seventh century at the latest. No one, however, asserted that James was buried in Spain until the ninth century. Bishop Theodemar of Iria (d. 847) discovered the alleged remains of St. James at Compostela sometime between 818 and 842. King Alfonso III of Asturias (866-910) heavily patronized the cult of James and built a large church there in 899. By the mid-tenth century, pilgrims from outside Spain were journeying to Compostela. For the Compostela cult in Carolingian Francia, see Freulf of Lisieux, *Historiae*, 2.2.4 – ed. M. I. ALLEN, Turnhout, 2002 (*CC CM*, 169A), p. 501; Usuard of Saint-Germain-des-Prés, *Martyrologium*, July 25, *PL* 124, col. 295; for the argument that Compostela did not become an important shrine even in Spain until the 880s, R. A. FLETCHER, *Saint James's Catapult: The Life and Times of Diego Gelmírez of Santiago de Compostela*, Oxford, 1984, pp. 53-77.

¹¹⁷ Herwagen Homiliary, 15, *PL* 94, cols. 500B-501A.

¹¹⁸ *Hodie, fratres charissimi, in pugnam contra diabolum intramus, et debemus illum uincere per totam quadragesimam, et propter hoc imponimus hodie cineres super capita nostra ... Propterea, fratres charissimi, hodie laboratis euomere peccata uestra*, Herwagen Homiliary, 15, *PL* 94, cols. 500B, 500D-501A.

¹¹⁹ Pembroke 19 is the only known original Ash Wednesday sermon extant from the ninth century. Some late ninth-century homiliaries contain Patristic sermons rubricated for the feast (although first written for some other occasion). For instance, the Sermonary of Beaune, probably from the Archdiocese of Salzburg, treats Caesarius, *Serm.* 146 and Augustine, *Hom.* 205 as Ash Wednesday sermons. The compiler selected Caesarius' work, because it discusses the Ash Wednesday pericope (Matt 6:16-21) and Augustine's because it is for the start of the Lenten fast (in his time, Lent began Quadragesima Sunday rather than Ash Wednesday). Similarly, a sermon in the Bavarian Homiliary (no. 32 in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, MS Clm. 19107, fols. 68v-69r) re-deploys a section on Matt: 6:16-21 from Epiphanius Latinus, *Interpretatio Euangeliorum*, 20, *PLS* 3, cols. 852-852; J. E. CROSS, *Cambridge Pembroke College MS.25: A Carolingian Sermonary used by Anglo-Saxon Preachers*, London, 1987; R. ÉTAIX, "Le sermonnaire carolingien de Beaune", *Revue des Études Augustiniennes*, 25 (1979), pp. 106-149; R. ÉTAIX, *Homéliaires patristiques latins, Recueil d'études de manuscrits médiévaux*, Paris, 1994, pp. 607, 624; RISTUCCIA, "Transmission", pp. 193, 230, 233, 235, 239, 287, 337, 341, 347; for some early Ash Wednesday homilies, see Atto of Vercelli, *Serm.*, 5-6, *PL* 134, cols. 839-842; Ælfric, *Lives of Saints* 12.1-60 – ed. W. W. Skeat,

while clergy employed ashes in public penance much earlier, it was only in the middle of the tenth century that the priests of certain dioceses began to place ashes on the forehead of the entire congregation (as opposed to only on the heads of public penitents) on a single day annually.¹²⁰ Ashing became universal after Urban II required that all churches institute the ashing of the laity at the Council of Benevento in 1091. Indeed, the Herwagen preacher produced one of the first fully original sermons for Ash Wednesday extant.¹²¹ It could not have antedated the late tenth century.

Just as the popularization of the Camino de Santiago and Ash Wednesday supplies a *terminus post quem* of the Herwagen preacher, the sermon for the Feast of St. Peter in Chains (August 1) provides an *ante quem*.¹²² Borrowing on a section from the *Passio Alexandri* for his narrative, this text

London, 1881 (*EETS o.s.*, 76), pp. 260-265; Bruno of Segni, *Hom.*, 25, *PL* 165, col. 778; Ivo of Chartres, *Serm.*, 13, *PL* 162, cols. 579-581; J. E. CROSS and A. BROWN, "Wulfstan and Abbo of Saint-Germain-des-Près", *Mediaevalia*, 15 (1993), pp. 86-91.

¹²⁰ K. W. STEVENSON, *Worship: Wonderful and Sacred Mystery*, Washington, DC, 1992, pp. 159-187; T. J. TALLEY, *The Origins of the Liturgical Year*, New York, 1986, pp. 219-224; see, for instance, Peter Damian, *Vita Sancti Odilonis*, *PL* 144, col. 930; Peter Damian, *Ep.*, 70.11 – ed. Ernst DÜMLER, Berlin, 1895 (*MGH Epp. kaiserzeit*, 4.1); *Liber Quare*, additio 78, GÖTZ, pp. 223-224; Council of Trier (927), cc. 15, 17 – ed. E.-D. HEHL, Hanover, 1987 (*MGH Concilia*, 6.1), pp. 83, 85; C. VOGEL, *Le Pontifical romano-germanique du dixième siècle*, ordo 99.71-74, Vatican City, 1963-72, vol. 2, p. 21.

¹²¹ Beyond exhorting Lenten observance, the preacher devotes most of the Ash Wednesday sermon to typologies. These types include the dust from which Adam was created, the fast of Nineveh in Jonah 3, and a legend about ancient horsemen prepared for battle. Strangely, the preacher twice uses the phrase *in capite* to mean the end, rather than the beginning, of a period. Evidently, the standard phrase for Ash Wednesday (*caput ieiunii*) guided the preacher. The preacher relates the entire story of the first three chapters of Jonah. While most of this content is directly from the Bible, the sermon includes the detail that Jonah lost all his hair due to the heat of the whale's stomach: *ipse autem exiens de ore piscis, nesciebat ubi esset, et perdiderat omnes capillos propter piscis calorem, et quaesiuit ab hominibus quae terra esset illa, et dixerunt quia Niniue est*, Herwagen Homiliary, 15, *PL* 94, col. 500D; although some earlier texts mention Jonah's baldness (particularly Jewish texts), the Herwagen preacher probably learned the idea from artistic depictions of the bald prophet. For the apocryphal tradition of Jonah's baldness, see J. ZIOLKOWSKI, *Fairy Tales from Before Fairy Tales: The Medieval Latin Past of Wonderful Lies*, Ann Arbor, MI, 2007, pp. 84-88; J. B. FRIEDMAN, "Bald Jonah and the Exegesis of 2 Kings 2.23", *Traditio*, 44 (1988), pp. 125-144.

¹²² *Notandum est, fratres charissimi, qua de causa celebretur festiuitas sancti Petri a uinculis, scilicet, Kalendis Augusti*, Herwagen Homiliary, 12, *PL* 94, cols. 498C; *BHL* 6685; while the tale of Quirinus and Balbina appears in various texts, it is not the most common narrative about the discovery of the chains of Peter. The normal story concerns Empress Eudoxia, the wife of Theodosius II, and is much less exciting. For the Quirinus and Balbina story, see *BHL* 6680-6684; the interpolated Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, *Hom.*, 38, *PL* 95, cols. 1485B-1489D; Bede, *Martyrologium*, 31 Mar., *PL* 94, cols. 870A-870B; Ado of Vienne, *Martyrologium*, 30 Mar.-31 Mar., 3 May, *PL* 123, cols. 243B-244C, 259B; Notker of St. Gall, *Martyrologium*, 30 Mar.-31 Mar., 3 May, *PL* 131, cols. 1060A-1060C, 1076B.

tells how Pope Alexander I and Balbina, the sick daughter of the Roman tribune Quirinus, discovered Peter's shackles.¹²³ The preacher altered parts of the *Passio Alexandri's* narrative, claiming, for example, that Alexander built the church of San Pietro in Vincoli in Rome to hold the relic and established the new feast, details not in the original passion text.¹²⁴ While a number of the Herwagen preacher's sermons survives in late medieval codices, the Peter in Chains sermon is the only one extant in an early manuscript: London, BL, Royal 2.C.3, fols. 96-97, an interpolated manuscript of the Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, copied in England during the last quarter of the eleventh century.¹²⁵ The Herwagen preacher thus must have worked sometime in the broad range of 950 to 1100; he deliberately remodeled the legends of Late Antique saints to fit the preconceptions of his largely lay congregation.

6. *The Herwagen Homiliary in an Age of Reform*

During the eleventh century, continental Europe was riven with the debates surrounding the papal reform movement, which began in earnest

¹²³ *Passio Alexandri*, cc. 8-14, *AASS*, May 1, cols. 372F-373F; *BHL* 266; the Herwagen preacher may not have known Alexander's hagiography directly, but instead through a martyrology dependent on the passion account. Alexander I has his feast day on May 3, Quirinus on March 30, and Balbina on March 31. Outside Rome, Quirinus and Balbina are most associated with the Rhineland centers of Cologne and Neuss. For this passion account, see K. Sessa, "Domestic Conversions: Households and Bishops in the Late Antique 'Papal Legends,'" in *Religion, Dynasty, and Patronage in Early Christian Rome, 400-800* – ed. K. Cooper – J. Hillner, Cambridge, 2011, pp. 100-113; K. Sessa, *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy*, Cambridge, 2012, pp. 97-98, 149, 247-273.

¹²⁴ The Herwagen preacher presents Balbina, rather than her father, as the primary actor. According to the tale, when Alexander was in a jail, he converted Balbina and advised her to search for Peter's fetters. Although the passion claims Alexander cured Balbina, in the sermon, Balbina is only healed after discovering and kissing the relic. These changes allow the Herwagen preacher to forge a cohesive origin story out of an otherwise rather diffuse passion account; Herwagen Homiliary, 12, *PL* 94, cols. 498C-498D.

¹²⁵ London, BL, Royal 2.C.3 was produced probably at Rochester. Since Paul's original homiliary did not include a sermon for St. Peter in Chains, scribes elsewhere also interpolated into the collection a sermon for this feast; cf. the interpolated Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, *Hom.*, 38, *PL* 95, cols. 1485B-1489D; G. F. Warner – J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Old Royal and King's Collections I*, London, 1921, p. 51; a date in the late tenth or more likely eleventh century makes the Herwagen preacher a rough contemporary of another homilist who borrowed heavily on the *Virtutes apostolorum* and similar hagiographies in his sanctoral sermons: Ælfric of Eynsham. Ælfric, admittedly, often knew these sources indirectly, through mediators like the Cotton-Corpus Legendary; *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha* – ed. F. M. Biggs, Kalamazoo, MI, 2007, pp. 33-40, 43-44, 50-55, 67-70.

with the ascension of Leo IX in 1049 and culminated in the Gregorian Reform and the Investiture Controversy at the end of the century. Close examination of two sermons in the Herwagen Homiliary demonstrates both that the Herwagen preacher lived during these reform movements and that his sermons partly intoned his own imperialist position. Although the Herwagen preacher defended certain elements of the papal reform (in particular, the insistence on priestly celibacy), he endorsed lay investiture and the sacral role of the Holy Roman emperor.¹²⁶

Mariological interest appears in many sermons in the homiliary.¹²⁷ In the Christmas Dawn sermon, for instance, the cleric starts out as if he is going to interpret Titus 3:4-7, the standard epistle pericope, but he actually devotes himself mainly to mystical Mariology.¹²⁸ Similarly Mariological imagery appears in the sermon on Ezekiel's vision of a tree.¹²⁹ The Herwagen preacher describes the prophet seeing a vision of a tree with three branches, four roots, and seven leaves, in the middle of which the sun, moon, and twelve stars shone. The sermon expounds this revelation, using typological techniques, to understand, for example, the branches as

¹²⁶ A section in the Peter and Paul sermon attacks Simoniacs, another target of the Gregorian reformers. After Simon Magus tries to buy the *uirtus* of the apostles, Peter curses him. *Virtus*, here, probably refers to both miraculous and sacramental power. Simon, then, becomes an enemy of the faith, with demonic *uirtus*. The Herwagen preacher adds an editorial comment that Peter's curse applies to all who try to buy church offices (*honores*): *nec homo posset emere, uel uendere, et homines qui illam emere putant, facti sunt maledicti et separati a deo. Maledictio ista primum super Simonem magum uenit, et super illos qui honorem sanctae ecclesiae uendunt et emunt*; Herwagen Homiliary, 10, *PL* 94, cols. 496B-497C.

¹²⁷ In the *Inuentio* sermon, for instance, Silvester tells Constantine to confess faith in the son of the virgin (*filium uirginis*) rather than the son of God (*filium dei*), as the sermon's source, the *Actus Siluestri*, reads; Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495B; *Actus Siluestri papae*, in *Sanctuarium seu Vitae sanctorum*, vol. 2 – ed. B. MOMBRITIUS, Paris, 1910, p. 512.

¹²⁸ The homilist uses the Titus passage as a bridge to a discussion of Mary's perpetual virginity. The homilist alludes to the typology of Gideon's fleece as Mary's womb and cites Ps. 72:6 (71:6) and Isa. 45:8 as parallel passages. He provides a number of numerical lists, like the four parts of an ear of corn, the three times for mass, the three states of man, and the three theological virtues. The division of an ear of corn (*spica*) into four parts: the husk (*palea*), stem (*culmus*), bristle (*arista*), and seed (*granum*), each with a different Christological meaning, parallels similar fourfold divisions elsewhere; Herwagen Homiliary, 11, *PL* 94, col. 498B; Jerome, *Contra Iohannem* 26 – ed. J.-L. FEIERTAG, Turnhout, 1999 (*CC SL*, 79A), p. 44; Primasius, *In Apocalypsin* 4.14 – ed. A. W. ADAMS, Turnhout, 1985 (*CC SL*, 92), pp. 218-219; Peter Damian, *Serm.* 28, *PL* 144, cols. 655C-655D.

¹²⁹ This Christmas sermon parallels the Ezekiel homily. Both are brief, supply mystical and Mariological interpretations, show interest in numerical lists and vegetative imagery, and quote biblical proof-texts analogously. Herwagen Homiliary, 11, *PL* 94, cols. 498A-498B; Herwagen Homiliary, 5, *PL* 94, cols. 490A-490C; compare also the introduction to the Laurence sermon, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, cols. 491B-491D.

the Trinity and the moon as the Virgin.¹³⁰ Although the prophet Ezekiel regularly appears in Old Testament biblical apocrypha, no clear parallel to this prophecy of the tree exists.¹³¹ Judging from the homilist's technique elsewhere, the Herwagen preacher may have constructed his sermon out of a series of rewritten extracts from some earlier Latin apocrypha.¹³² But he may also have simply assembled the vision from various biblical passages without any prior apocryphal authority.¹³³

Although Mariological interest pervades the homiliary, the cleric devotes only one sermon, the eighteenth, to a specifically Marian feast: the Assump-

¹³⁰ Herwagen Homiliary, 5, *PL* 94, cols. 490A-490C; the homilist cites as support: Ps. 19:4 (18:5), Ps. 1:4, Isa. 11:1, John 1:9. The Ezekiel sermon shares its length and some language with homilies on Bartholomew and on Simon and Jude. Most strikingly, compare *eo ducente*, Herwagen Homiliary, 5, *PL* 94, col. 490C; and *eo amplius ducenti*, Herwagen Homiliary, 4, *PL* 94, col. 490A; the occasion for the Ezekiel homily is uncertain. It probably served as a generic reading, adaptable to many occasions, particularly Advent.

¹³¹ The imagery from the sermon mixes elements from Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the trees in Dan. 4:1-27 with the parable of the cedar tree in Ezek. 31:1-18 (cf. Ezek. 17:1-24). The author, however, has added elements to this prophecy such as the sun, moon, and twelve stars, which derive from other scriptural passages (cf. Gen. 37:9; Rev. 12:1). If the preacher composed this Ezekiel sermon out of extracts from some older text, then the last sentence is likely an original homiletic closing which he wrote specifically to make the text more sermonic: *nos eum deprecemur ut ille dignetur illuminare corda, et tenebras uitiorum abolere ut eo ducente ad coelestem patriam peruenire ualeamus*; Herwagen Homiliary, 5, *PL* 94, col. 490C; a similar passage occurs elsewhere in the Herwagen preacher's works: *et precabatur sanctum Laurentium ut eum illuminaret*, Herwagen Homiliary, 7, *PL* 94, col. 492C.

¹³² A related sermon from the fifteenth century by Johannes Currifex de Gamundia borrows on both Dan. 4:10 and Matt. 11:3 (Luke 7:19). Matt. 11:2-10 is a standard lection for the third Sunday of Advent, so the Herwagen homily may be for this Sunday. Currifex (d. 1441), a Swiss Augustinian, must have borrowed on a source related to the Herwagen homily on Ezekiel, as his language is strikingly close; cf. *Ezechiel propheta uidit quamdam arborem, habentem quatuor radices*, Herwagen Homiliary, 4, *PL* 94, col. 490A; *tu es qui uenturus es ... legitur quod Ezechiel propheta uidit in spiritu unam arborem in medio terrae*, Johannes Currifex de Gamundia, *Sermo 3 de tempore* (an alternative version of this Currifex sermon reads: *legitur quod Ezechiel propheta in spiritu contemplatus est arborem habentem quatuor radices*); see Solothurn, Zentralbibliothek, S I 195, fols. 7v-9r; A. SCHÖNHERR, *Die Mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Zentralbibliothek Solothurn*, Solothurn, 1964, pp. 137, 275; L. CEYSSENS, "Les dernières années de Boonen: archévêque de Malines (à suivre)", *Augustiniana*, 11 (1961), pp. 87-120.

¹³³ If a prior source exists, it was probably a version of the *Vitae Prophetarum*, a collection of biographic legends on the prophets. Several Latin versions of the *Vitae Prophetarum* survive, with the earliest dating to the sixth century at the latest, but none include this vision of the tree. The tradition was diverse, so an undiscovered version of the *Vitae Prophetarum* containing this image is plausible; *The Apocryphal Ezekiel* – ed. M. E. STONE, et al., Atlanta, 2000, pp. 75-79; D. SATRAN, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine: Reassessing the Lives of the Prophets*, Leiden, 1995; cf. Peter Comestor, *Historia Scholastica*, *PL* 198, cols. 1441B-1446D. For apocryphal traditions about Daniel, see L. DiTOMMASO, *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*, Leiden, 2005.

tion (August 15).¹³⁴ After a brief introduction, most of the sermon relates a miracle story set during of Pope Zephyrinus (199-217). The preacher probably adapts some origin myth about the foundation of the church of St. Maria in Trastevere.¹³⁵ But the miracle of the Clerk of Pisa, common in high medieval accounts of the miracles of the Virgin, contains the basic elements of the story: a rich Italian priest about to be nobly married who is shamed into celibacy by the Virgin.¹³⁶ The Herwagen preacher and the later author of the Clerk of Pisa must have shared a source.¹³⁷

¹³⁴ The homilist states at the start: *hodie, fratres charissimi, celebramus festiuitatem sanctae Mariae, dei genitricis quae hodie translata est in coelum de mundo*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, col. 422B; the preacher has a high view of Mary's power, claiming that her prayers uphold the existence of the world: *mundus deletus esset, nisi per preces sanctae Mariae sustineatur*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, col. 422B; belief in the assumption did not become the official dogma of the Catholic Church until 1950, but the doctrine and feast already were spreading across the Latin West by the sixth century. Between 450 and 600 a variety of stories about Mary's assumption or dormition appeared all over the Mediterranean world. Some version of these narratives is probably ante-Nicene. See S. J. SHOEMAKER, *Ancient Traditions of the Virgin Mary's Dormition and Assumption*, Oxford, 2002; M. CLAYTON, *The Apocryphal Gospels of Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge, 1998.

¹³⁵ Callixtus I, Zephyrinus' successor as pope, supposedly established this basilica ca. 222. Although the name *Basilica Mariae trans Tiberim* was standard by the ninth century, some medieval authors remembered Callixtus' role; cf. Flodoard of Rheims, *De Christi triumphis*, 4.8, PL 135, cols. 655C-655D; *Passio Callixti*, 1, AASS, Oct. 6, cols. 439C, 442A; *Translatio Callixti*, AASS, Oct. 6, col. 443B; the priest later gives the church where he sees the Marian apparition to Pope Zephyrinus: *clericum quemdam, qui fuit Romae ... multos habebat honores, multas possessiones, capellamque uicinam domui suae in honore beatae Mariae consecratam ... clericus uero accessit ad beatum Zephirim papam, qui eo tempore erat, quaerens consilium, quid facere deberet; qui praecepit ei ut omnia quae haberet donaret ecclesiae in qua uisionem uiderat*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, cols. 422B, 423A.

¹³⁶ The Clerk of Pisa story is part of the "H. M." group, the most widely circulated collection of miracles of the Virgin, produced in the early twelfth century. The clerk was supposedly a priest at the church of Sts. Hippolytus and Cassian in Pisa. Versions of this story appear, for instance, in E. F. DEXTER, *Miracula Sanctae Virginis Mariae*, Madison, 1927, pp. 30-31; G. F. WARNER, *Miracles de Notre Dame Collected by Jean Mielot*, Westminster, 1885, pp. xi-xii, xvii-xviii; one twelfth-century version dates the clerk to the reign of Charlemagne and claims the clerk was a brother of the king of Hungary who became the bishop of Aquileia, Pseudo-Anselm, *Sermo de conceptione Beatae Mariae*, PL 159, cols. 319A-324A; A. W. BOYARIN, *Miracles of the Virgin in Medieval England: Law and Jewishness in the Marian Legends*, Woodbridge, 2010; R. W. SOUTHERN, "The English Origins of the 'Miracles of the Virgin'", *Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 4 (1958), pp. 176-216; A. MUSSAFIA, *Studien zu den mittelalterlichen Marienlegenden*, Vienna, 1898, pp. 9-23; A. PONCELET, "Initia miraculorum B. Virginis Mariae", *Analecta Bollandiana*, 21 (1902), nos. 94, 109, 209, 1698, pp. 251-252, 258, 351; H. L. D. WARD - J. A. HERBERT, *Catalogue of Romances in the Department of Manuscripts*, 3 vols., London, 1883-1910, vol. 2, pp. 586-594.

¹³⁷ The Herwagen preacher read the version of the miracle of the Clerk of Rome, as preserved in two fourteenth-century collections of fables and religious tales (London, BL, Harley 2851 and London, BL, Add. 11579). Since the Clerk of Rome tale has never been

The Herwagen miracle account depicts a Roman priest whose noble relatives pressure him into marriage.¹³⁸ The miracle tale contrasts the pious priest and his horse-riding relatives (who are repeatedly called *militēs*).¹³⁹ The rivalry between the cleric and the knight is a major theme in medieval literature. On his wedding day, the priest goes to sing the hours at the local Marian church (as was his daily custom), and the Virgin appears to him.¹⁴⁰ Mary rebukes the priest, complaining that he has abandoned his devotion to her and replaced her with his new bride.¹⁴¹ Chastened, the priest seeks the counsel of Pope Zephyrinus, rejects his fiancée, gives away his wealth to the church, and becomes a monk.

Judging from the moral of the story, the preacher must have taught during a period when married priests were common, but rigorists promoted a celibate priesthood.¹⁴² Sometime in the eleventh century is likely, probably after the Easter Synod of 1049.¹⁴³ The Roman knightly nobility (*nobiles*,

edited from either manuscript, the exact relationship between the Herwagen preacher and these later collections is unclear. (I hope to edit and examine this text in a later article.) Warner quotes a number of parallel passages from Add. 11579: *clericus quidam erat Romae de nobili genere ... quicumque ex parentibus meis uult, accipiat meam coniugem, quia amplius non habeo aliam, nisi beatam Mariam, cui semper seruire desidero*, WARNER, *Miracles*, p. xi; cf. Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, cols. 422B, 423A; the Herwagen preacher probably knew a manuscript similar to Harley 2851, for this codex also includes redaction IV of the *Visio Pauli* and the tale of Macarius and the skull; PONCELET, "Initia", nos. 188, 192, p. 257; WARD, *Catalogue*, vol. 2, pp. 401-402, 669-671, 748, vol. 3, pp. 38-41, 503-509, 528-532.

¹³⁸ The homilist describes these relatives as *parentes* but also claims the priest's father and mother were dead, indicating *parentes* means kinsmen here, as it can; Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, cols. 422B-422C.

¹³⁹ Right before the wedding, the priest mounts a horse alongside his relatives. Since priests were not supposed to ride horses, this action symbolizes the temptation of worldliness; Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, col. 422C.

¹⁴⁰ The sermon mentions a "chapel near his house consecrated to Mary" (*capellamque uicinam domui suae in honore beatae Mariae consecratam*) and later refers to it as an *ecclesia*. Seemingly, the whole church, rather than just one niche, was dedicated to the Virgin. The use of the word *capella* shows the medieval date of the sermon; Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, col. 422B.

¹⁴¹ Mary's language is reminiscent of the Song of Songs: *ego sum amica tua, quam semper dilexisti ... Nonne sum satis pulchra? An quaeris aliam, quae habet maiorem pulchritudinem quam ego*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, cols. 422C-423A.

¹⁴² Concern for clerical celibacy also appears in the opening: *diligit uirgines, si in uera uirginitate consistant; custodit uiduas, si permaneant in uera uiduitate*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, PL 94, col. 422B; the congregation may have included priests, nuns, and widows, as well as lay people.

¹⁴³ The Easter Synod, which condemned simony and clerical marriage, was the first major act of Leo IX's reign. An earlier date is also possible, as priestly celibacy was already a widespread aspiration in the Carolingian period. The sermon is earlier than the condemnation of clerical marriage at the First Lateran Council (1123). On the history of clerical celibacy, see H. L. PARISH, *Clerical Celibacy in the West: c. 1100-1700*, Farnham, UK, 2010, pp. 87-122.

meliores, milites) are the villains of this sermon due to their concern for lineage rather than virginity. This portrayal may reflect the great power of the Roman noble families like the Tuscullani and Crescentii, who dominated the unreformed papacy during the tenth and first half of the eleventh century.¹⁴⁴ Eleventh-century reformers like Leo IX worked against the power of these clans, just as the Virgin does in the homily.¹⁴⁵

While the Herwagen preacher's advocacy of clerical celibacy demonstrates his favor for aspects of the papal reform, his other controversialist sermon reveals his clear support for an imperialist position. The Herwagen homilist was a reformer, but a conservative reformer (like Peter Damian, Leo IX, and the emperor Henry III) who supported mutual reliance between the Pope and Holy Roman Emperor. The preacher's sermon for the feast of the discovery of the True Cross (May 3) takes its information from two separate hagiographies: the late fifth-century life of Pope Silvester and the *Inuentio Crucis* (also known as the Judas Cyriacus legend).¹⁴⁶ Although three separate Latin translations of the *Inuentio Crucis* existed by 1000, the

¹⁴⁴ Following this miracle account, the preacher tells his audience that before Mary ascended, Christ gathered all the apostles from all the parts of the earth that they might attend her at her death. Supposedly, Christ worked this wonder at the request of Mary and John the Evangelist. The Herwagen preacher focuses his account on the apostle John, rather than Mary. In both the story of the Roman priest and the assumption, the preacher highlights not Mary, but a male cleric who approaches God through Mary's mediation. This story of the summoning together of the apostles already appeared in early apocrypha, like Pseudo-Melito's fifth-century *Transitus Mariae* (which is the Herwagen preacher's source); Herwagen Homiliary, 18, *PL* 94, cols. 423A-423B; *BHL* 5348-5354; Pseudo-Melito, *Transitus Mariae*, cc. 1-6, C. VON TISCHENDORF, *Apocalypses apocryphae*, Leipzig, 1866, pp. 124-128; M. HAMBACH-REINISCH, *Ein Neuer Transitus Mariae des Pseudo-Melito*, Rome, 1962, pp. 88-108; M. CLAYTON, "The *Transitus Mariae*: The Tradition and Its Origin", *Apocrypha*, 10 (1999), pp. 74-98; the sermon's dependence on the *Transitus* is clear from the sequence of the narrative. For the Palm of the Tree of Life Tradition, the basis of this sermon, see SHOEMAKER, *Ancient Traditions*, pp. 32-45.

¹⁴⁵ Throughout the homily, the preacher encourages his congregation to pray for Mary's intercession: *quia legimus, postquam coelos ascendit ipsa, assidue stat coram deo, orationem pro peccatis nostris effundens ... Nunc autem, fratres, seruiamus semper tali reginae, quae non derelinquit sperantes in se ... ut semper uicina ante faciem suam oraret pro peccatoribus ... ubi nunc stat in conspectu eius, non cessans pro peccatoribus exorare. Toto igitur affectu confugiamus ad eam uenire*, Herwagen Homiliary, 18, *PL* 94, col. 422B, 423A-423B.

¹⁴⁶ The Herwagen preacher may have known a manuscript which placed the Judas Cyriacus text directly after the *Actus Siluestri*, as such codices survive. St. Silvester has a feast on December 31, St. Helena on August 18, and St. Judas Cyriacus on May 4. The opening of the sermon states that the sermon was for the discovery of the cross, rather than these other feasts: *quomodo inuenta fuit sancta crux, scire debemus*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 494D; *BHL* 4175; BLUMENKRANZ, *Auteurs chrétiens*, pp. 135-137; Blumenkranz dated the sermons of the Herwagen Homiliary to the middle of the eighth century. Blumenkranz also suggested that the confusing style of the *Inuentio* sermon may point to a stenographer's influence.

Herwagen preacher evidently used redaction A—the earliest, linguistically simplest, and most common.¹⁴⁷ When treating the story of the *Inuentio Crucis*, the preacher stays close to his source.

In contrast, the homilist diverges greatly from his source text when he employs the *Actus Siluestri*.¹⁴⁸ Indeed, the differences between the homily and the original hagiography are so many that the Herwagen preacher must have known later legends about Silvester and Constantine (such as those preserved in the Donation of Constantine) as well.¹⁴⁹ The Herwagen homily, for instance, refers to how Constantine departed to build Constantinople, after giving the lands around Rome to St. Peter, details dependent on the Donation of Constantine legend rather than the original *Actus*.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁷ All three Latin texts are edited in BORGEHAMMER, *How the Holy Cross*. Redaction A is from the mid-fifth century and written in plain Latin like that of the Herwagen preacher, while the B and C both employ the classicizing Latin of the Carolingian period. Since the Herwagen homily includes the story of the discovery of the holy nails, the preacher clearly did not use redaction C (which leaves out the nails). Redaction B only survives in one manuscript and does not include Constantine's vision of an angel, unlike redaction A and the Herwagen sermon; Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495B-495D; *Inuentio Crucis A*, cc. 1, 3-4, 7-15 – ed. BORGEHAMMER, *How the Holy Cross*, pp. 255-258, 261-271; *Vita Iudae Quiriaci*, *AASS*, May 1, cols. 445C-448A.

¹⁴⁸ Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, cols. 494D-495B; *BHL* 3772, 4169-4175, 7022-7025, 7736-7737; *Actus Siluestri papae*, MOMBRIUS, vol. 2, pp. 508-531 (the Herwagen preacher borrows from pp. 510-514, 529-531); most of Mombricitus' text is also printed in C. B. COLEMAN, "Constantine the Great and Christianity", *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, 60:1 (1914), pp. 217-227; although most scholars still use Mombricitus' edition, some prefer the version in P. DE LEO, *Il constitutum Constantini: Compilazione agiografica del sec. VIII*, Reggio di Calabria, 1974, pp. 153-211; for the legends around Pope Silvester, see D. OGDEN, *Drakon: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*, Oxford, 2013, pp. 383-426; L. DUCHESNE, "S. Maria Antiqua: Notes sur la topographie de Rome au moyen-âge", *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 17 (1897), pp. 13-37; R. J. LOENERTZ, "Actus Silvestri, genèse d'une légende", *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, 70 (1975), pp. 426-439; W. POHLKAMP, "Tradition und Topographic: Papst Sylvester I. (314–335) und der Drache vom Forum Romanum", *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte*, 78 (1983), pp. 1–100; N. J. RISTUCCIA, "The Rise of Spuralia: Medieval Festival and Modern Myth", *Comitatus*, 44 (2013), pp. 62-66; T. CANELLA, *Gli Actus Silvestri: Genesi di una leggenda su Costantino imperatore*, Spoleto, 2006.

¹⁴⁹ The general story arc and some of the language obviously come from the *Actus Siluestri*. Cf.: *melius est ut ego peream, quam tot homines cum filiis*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495A; *melius est enim pro salute innocentum mori quam per interitum eorum uitam recuperare crudelem*, *Actus Siluestri papae*, MOMBRIUS, p. 510; there are many differences, though, both major and minor. For instance, in the sermon, a single *medicus* recommends the blood bath cure for leprosy, rather than the *pontifices Capitolii*. (Indeed, in the *Actus*, both the *magi* and the *medici* are unable to help the emperor.) The blood is collected in a hogshhead (*dolium*), rather than in a pool (*piscina*). Since Constantine is later baptized in water which is carried forth (*deferri*), this hogshhead is probably reused.

¹⁵⁰ *Post haec uocauit suos milites dicens se mare transire uelle, et omnia quae haberet in hac parte, sancto Petro daturum, et ita factum est. Transiuit mare, et fecit Constantinopolim*, Her-

Most of the preacher's alterations, however, exalt the prestige of Constantine and Helena, glorifying the imperial house—even at the expense of the church.¹⁵¹ The author of the *Actus Siluestri*, for instance, ends the hagiography with a story about Pope Silvester killing a dragon. The Herwagen preacher, in contrast, starts with this tale and claims that Constantine himself, rather than Pope Silvester, was the dragon-slayer.¹⁵² When Constantine converts, he adds the sign of the cross to his *lancea*. While *lancea* is hardly a normal Latin word for a standard, the Ottonian and Salian emperors employed the relic of the Holy Lance (*sacra lancea*) as their military insignia.¹⁵³

The preacher also modifies the character of Helena, Constantine's mother. In the *Actus*, she is an ardent Jew who eventually converts, but the Herwagen sermon portrays her as a Christian even before her son's conversion.¹⁵⁴ Shockingly, the preacher depicts Helena investing Silvester with

wagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495B; the provenance of the Donation of Constantine is debated. Although some prefer Rome during the reign of Pope Stephen II (752-757), Northern France during the second quarter of ninth century is more likely. Regardless, the Leo-Humbert recension of the Donation (the most influential recension during the Middle Ages) was produced in Rome right around 1050; J. FRIED, *The Donation of Constantine and Constitutum Constantini*, Berlin, 2007; *Constitutum Constantini* – ed. H. FUHRMANN, Hanover, 1968 (*MGH Fontes iuris*, 10), pp. 56-97.

¹⁵¹ The preacher calls Constantine a *rex* rather than an *imperator* (the original *Actus* employs *imperator* and *Augustus*), and Helena a *regina*. Perhaps this reflects the usage of the title “king of the Romans” (*Romanorum rex*) for the ruler of the empire before coronation as emperor by the pope, a usage which began with Henry II in 1014. At the beginning of the homily, after all, Silvester has not yet crowned Constantine and Helena, for they are still non-Christians.

¹⁵² According to the preacher, Constantine became sick with leprosy after this fight due to the dragon's breath. The *Actus* claims the leprosy was divine punishment for Constantine's earlier persecution of the Christians. The Herwagen preacher only calls the dragon a *serpens*, never a *draco*, unlike the *Actus*; Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 494D; *Actus Siluestri papae*, MOMBRITIUS, pp. 510, 529-530.

¹⁵³ *Videbis signum crucis in coelo, et facies illud in lancea, et securus ingredere bellum, et habebis uictoriam ... inuenerunt clauos, quos fixerunt in manibus et pedibus domini, et unum ex illis dedit Helena Constantino, quem posuit in freno equi sui, et post haec non fuit uictus in bello*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, cols. 495C-495D; *Inuentio Crucis A*, cc. 1, 3-4, BORGEHAMMER, pp. 255-258; the German emperors, moreover, believed that the Holy Lance contained one of the nails from the cross. The Herwagen preacher, tellingly, mentions that Helena sent Constantine a nail from the cross to add to his armor to ensure victory.

¹⁵⁴ *Constantinus dixit matri suae, quomodo Petrus et Paulus ei dixerunt. Quo audito regina gauisa est, et quaesiuit sanctum Siluestrum, et dixit ei quomodo suus filius eum uidere uolebat. Quo audito sanctus Silvester, accipiens baculum, iuit ad Constantinum*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495A; contrast the starkly opposite depiction of Helena in *Actus Siluestri papae*, MOMBRITIUS, pp. 511, 515; A. HARBUS, *Helena of Britain in Medieval Legend*, Cambridge, 2002, pp. 9-51; indeed, Helena serves as mediator between Silvester and the emperor. The preacher's elevation of Helena's role serves both to foreshadow her import later in the

the papal crosier (*baculum*).¹⁵⁵ This portrait of Helena as *investrix* evinces both the empress's importance and the sermon's anti-Gregorian quality. No one, not even the most ardent partisan of the emperor, could have written such a scene after the Concordat of Worms in 1122, which explicitly forbade lay investiture *per anulum et baculum*.¹⁵⁶ Constantine, too, has sacral authority in the sermon. Indeed, he baptizes Judas Cyriacus and appoints him the Patriarch of Jerusalem.¹⁵⁷ Again, such imperial appointments to the episcopacy were one of the Gregorian reformers' main taboos. By weaving various sources about Constantine and emending strategically, the Herwagen preacher produces a sermon with a distinctly imperialist hue.

One final sign of the Herwagen preacher's imperial leanings appears in his Michaelmas sermon.¹⁵⁸ The sermon retells the narrative of Michael's apparition at a cave in Monte Gargano in Italy (allegedly on 8 May, 493) and the foundation of a popular pilgrimage site there.¹⁵⁹ Originally asso-

sermon as the discoverer of the true cross and to mirror the role mothers had in convincing Constantine to spare their sons early in the sermon. These mothers are Christians, for they pray to God on Constantine's behalf, causing God to send Constantine a vision of Peter and Paul.

¹⁵⁵ Around 1111, an imperial partisan from the abbey of Farfa argued that Constantine's gift of the papal tiara to Sylvester (recorded in the Donation) was a precedent justifying emperors investing bishops with the *baculum*, *Oxthodoxa defensio imperialis*, 4-5 – ed. L. De HEINEMANN, Hanover, 1892 (*MGH De Lite*, 2), pp. 537-538; Helena and Sylvester were both associated with the city of Trier's claim to have the relics of Matthias' body and the *baculum* of St. Peter, as well as primacy over the German church. This association between Helena, Sylvester, and the *baculum* may be the origin of the Herwagen preacher's assertion: *Treui-rentis matris aecclesiae, quae licet primatum petitione Helenae reginae a beatae memoriae papa Siluestro per corpus Mathiae apostoli et per baculum beati Petri acceperit*, Hugh of Flavigny, *Chronicon*, 1 – ed. G. H. PERTZ, Hanover, 1848 (*MGH SS*, 8), pp. 298, 341; *Gesta Treverorum*, 18 – ed. G. WAITZ, Hanover, 1848 (*MGH SS*, 8), p. 152.

¹⁵⁶ A partisan of the emperor may have written the sermon during the Investiture Controversy itself, but it must precede 1122; Henry V, *Constitutiones*, 107-108, ed. L. WEILAND, Hanover, 1893 (*MGH Const.*, 1), pp. 159-161.

¹⁵⁷ The sermon claims that Constantine: *postea baptizavit Iudam, imponens sibi nomen Quiracus, et constituit illum episcopum in Ierusalem*, Herwagen Homiliary, 9, *PL* 94, col. 495D; while the *Actus* mentions Constantine building churches to the apostles (i.e., St. Peter's Basilica, St. Paul's Outside the Walls), the Herwagen preacher has Constantine discovering the bodies of Peter and Paul in an old well, translating them, and presenting them as a gift to Sylvester. In another Herwagen sermon, a converted pagan king is ordained bishop over his kingdom and works many miracles. Evidently, the preacher conceived of monarchs as sacral, Herwagen Homiliary, 6, *PL* 94, col. 491A.

¹⁵⁸ Herwagen Homiliary, 17, *PL* 94, cols. 502D, 503B; for similar sermons, the interpolated Homiliary of Paul the Deacon, *Hom.*, 56, *PL* 95, cols. 1522B-1525A; Hrabanus Maurus, *Hom. ad Haistulfum*, 32, *PL* 110, cols. 60D-63C.

¹⁵⁹ Herwagen Homiliary, 17, *PL* 94, cols. 503A-503B; *BHL* 4790-4791, 5948-5950; for the cult of Michael on Monte Gargano, see JOHNSON, *Saint Michael the Archangel*, pp. 3-4, 35-41, 49-70, 110-115; J. C. ARNOLD, "Arcadia Becomes Jerusalem: Angelic Caverns and

ciated with the Lombard kings and the duchy of Benevento, the cult of Michael at Monte Gargano acquired renewed prominence at the time of the Ottonian dynasty, culminating in the legend of Emperor Henry II's vision of St. Michael at Gargano.¹⁶⁰ The Herwagen preacher's own loyalties to the late Ottonian or, more likely, the early Salian emperors may have incited his interest in the legends and cult of Gargano.¹⁶¹

Shrine Conversion at Monte Gargano", *Speculum*, 75:3 (2000), pp. 567-588; S. HAMILTON, "Otto III's Penance: a Case Study of Unity and Diversity in the Eleventh-century Church", *Studies in Church History*, 32 (1996), pp. 83-94; although most later accounts of this apparition date the event to 390, the earliest versions supply a more believable year of 493, during the reign of Bishop Laurence of Siponto; *Vita Minor Laurentii Sipontini*, 2, *AASS*, Feb. 2, cols. 61B-61E; *Vita Maior Laurentii Sipontini*, 3-4, *AASS*, Feb. 2, cols. 59A-60B; both *Vitae* of Laurence of Siponto date to the eleventh-century and are of dubious reliability. Although pilgrims from as far away as England were already visiting the grotto chapel by the eighth century, an anonymous Lombard author wrote the standard hagiographic account only around 800. This text, however, is probably based on a lost shorter work from the sixth century that contained the narrative of Garganus, the bull, and bishop Laurence. The later Lombard text also describes a battle between Naples and Benevento in 650, which was not in the original work; *Apparitio Sancti Michaelis in Monte Gargano*, *AASS*, May 8, cols. 61A-62C; *De apparitione Sancti Michaelis* – ed. G. WAITZ, Hanover, 1878 (*MGH SS rer. Lang.*), pp. 541-543; Ado of Vienne, *Martyrologium*, 29 Sept., *PL* 123.368A-369D; MACHIELSEN, *CPPMA*, IB, no. 5316, p. 808.

¹⁶⁰ Michael supposedly helped Otto I defeat the Magyars at the Battle of Lechfeld in 955. Although the legend of Henry II's vision only appeared in the thirteenth century, both Otto III and Henry II visited Monte Gargano as pilgrims and helped spread dedications to St. Michael at centers like Hildesheim and Bamberg. For the cult of Michael and the Ottonians, see D. F. CALLAHAN, "The Cult of St. Michael the Archangel and the 'Terrors of the Year 1000'", in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000: Religious Expectation and Social Change, 950-1050* – ed. R. LANDES et al., Oxford, 2003, pp. 181-204.

¹⁶¹ The sermon relates the key elements: the lost cow, the shot arrow which hits its archer, three days of fasting, Michael's apparition to the bishop, and the Sipontans entering the cave to discover that Michael himself has already built an altar. The preacher does simplify the tale, leaving out the battle scene and combining three different visions of the angel into one. Nonetheless, this sermon is a faithful rendition. The preacher may have known *Apparitio* account directly or through an intermediary such as Hrabanus Maurus' first homiliary. Ado of Vienne's popular martyrology, however, can not be the intermediary, for the Herwagen sermon employs some language from the original that does not appear in Ado. Consider, for instance: *scias quia uoluntate Dei hoc factum est*, Herwagen Homiliary, 17, *PL* 94, cols. 503A-503B; *sciatis, hoc mea gestum uoluntate*, *De apparitione Sancti Michaelis*, 2, WAITZ, pp. 541-542; Hrabanus Maurus, *Hom. ad Haistulfum*, 32, *PL* 110, cols. 61B; the homilist borrows from only four of the six chapters in the standard edition; *De apparitione Sancti Michaelis*, 1-2, 4-5, WAITZ, pp. 541-543; the Herwagen preacher is kinder to Garganus, the lord who owned the lost bull, than the original hagiography is. Garganus hunts for the bull alone (rather than with his serfs), does not use a poison arrow, and survives getting hit with his own arrow. The preacher also terms Michael "the commander of the heavenly army" (*princeps militiae coelestis*) rather than just *archangelus*. Michael promises to aid (*auxiliabor*) the Sipontans, presumably militarily, although no battle occurs in the sermon.

The Herwagen preacher, then, was likely a Southern German cleric with conservative reformist ideas living sometime between 1049 (the Easter Synod) and 1100 (the latest date for London, BL, Royal 2.C.3). Although no direct evidence proves that the preacher was a South German, he clearly lived in the Holy Roman Empire. Moreover, as discussed, the copyists of the lost manuscript probably worked in Southern Germany, where Pamelius later found the codex. Since the scribes had access to the Herwagen preacher's works, he likely lived in the same region. The preacher may have written in the last quarter of the century, during the time of hostility between emperor and pope that followed the publication of the *Dictatus Papae* in 1075. But a more likely date range is 1049 to 1074. The Herwagen preacher, after all, narrates events in his *Inuentio* sermon which would have horrified the Gregorian party. But he never becomes polemical; indeed, he does not even acknowledge that anyone could object to his sermon. Thus, he probably taught at a time before the papal and imperial parties fissured, when moderate imperialist reformism still held wide support.

Summary

The Herwagen preacher and the homiliary which preserves his work are unique witnesses to spiritual life in Southern Germany during the eleventh century. The preacher's collection represents one of the most coherent series of sanctoral and penitential sermons surviving from this period. Their simple style and lay focus makes these homilies especially noteworthy. Due partly to his pseudonymous character, the work of the Herwagen preacher has influenced little historical research on medieval preaching, on the Gregorian reform, on the development of the liturgical calendar, or on the reception of Late Antique hagiography during the Middle Ages. Scholars could profitably read other major sermon collections of the eleventh century, such as the works of Ælfric of Eynsham or Peter Damian, in comparison with the Herwagen series. Hopefully, a clearer understanding of this preacher's origins and corpus will better integrate him into the larger picture of his times.

Appendix: The Herwagen Homiliary

1. [85] (Herwagen, cols. 472-474. *PL* 94, cols. 477B-479A. *PL* 119, cols. 693B-696A) HOMELIA QUAE DICENDA EST IN SOLENNITATE SANCTI VVIGBERTI
Laudate et exsultate in Domino, dilectissimi fratres, qui deuotis mentibus ad solemniam sancti Wigberthi conuenistis ... // ... aeternam beatitudinem una cum sanctis suis accipere mereamur.
2. [86] (Herwagen, cols. 474-477. *PL* 94, cols. 479A-480D. *PL* 119, cols. 696B-698C) HOMILIA LECTIONIS EIUSDEM
 Restat igitur adhuc aliquid de beato Wigbertho breui sermone narrare, qui tantis in hoc mundo beneficiis ... // ... peruenire ualeamus, praestante domino nostro Iesu Christo, qui patria uirtute trinus et unus uiuit et regnat in saecula saeculorum. Amen.
3. [87] (Herwagen, cols. 477-488. *PL* 94, cols. 481A-489C) IN DIE FESTO SANC-TAE SCHOLASTICAE VIRGINIS. MATTH. 13
 In ille tempore dixit Iesus discipulis suis parabolam hanc: Simile est regnum coelorum thesauro abscondito in agro. Et reliqua.
 BEDAE PRESBYTERI DE EADEM LECTIONE
 Lectio sancti euangelii, fratres charissimi, quam modo uestra charitas audiuit, magnum humanis mentibus ... // ... praestante ipso qui digna promittere gaudia dignatus est suis famulis, qui uiuit et regnat per cuncta saecula saeculorum. Amen.
4. [88] (Herwagen, cols. 489-490. *PL* 94, cols. 489A-480A) SERMO DE SIMONE ET IUDA
 Simon et Iudas apostoli domini, ingressi regionem Persidis per uoluntatem dei ... // ... et eo amplius ducenti uiri passionem receperunt ipsi: et solemnitas passionis eorum celebratur V Calend. Novemb., et uiuunt in aeterna requie.
5. [89] (Herwagen, col. 490. *PL* 94, cols. 490A-490C) ALIUS SERMO
 Ezechiel propheta uidit quamdam arborem, habentem quatuor radices circa quatuor partes mundi extensas ... // ... et tenebras uitiorum abolere, ut eo ducente ad coelestem patriam peruenire ualeamus.
6. [90] (Herwagen, cols. 490-491. *PL* 94, cols. 490C-491B) DE S. BARTHOLOMAEO
 Cum uenisset beatus Bartholomaeus in Indiam, introiuit in templum ubi erat daemon, nomine Astarot ... // ... et migravit ad dominum per intercessionem sancti Bartholomaei: nos ita suscipiat deus, qui uiuit et regnat.
7. [91] (Herwagen, cols. 491-495. *PL* 94, cols. 491B-494A) DE S. LAURENTIO
Venite, filii, audite me, timorem domini docebo vos. Multum debemus diligere dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, qui per spiritum sanctum nos appellat ... // ... ut cum illo uitam aeternam habere mereamur, per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum. Amen.

8. [92](Herwagen, cols. 495-496. *PL* 94, cols. 494A-494D) DE SANCTO IOANNE EVANGELISTA

Hodie, fratres charissimi, celebramus festum sancti Ioannis euangelistae, non quando natus est in mundo ... // ... ita et nos per eius sanctam orationem possimus habere uitam aeternam. Amen.

9. [93](Herwagen, cols. 496-497. *PL* 94, cols. 494D-495D) DE INVENTIO SANCTAE CRUCIS

Quomodo inuenta fuit sancta crux, scire debemus. Fuit in tempore Constantini quidam serpens ... // ... et constituit illum episcopum in Ierusalem, per quem dominus dignatus est multa facere miracula.

10. [94](Herwagen, cols. 497-500. *PL* 94, cols. 495D-498A) DE SANCTO PETRO ET PAULO

Felix per omnes festum mundi cardines apostolorum Petri et Pauli sacratissimi praepollet alacriter. Fratres charissimi, legimus quod festiuitas apostolorum Petri et Pauli per quatuor partes mundi declaratur ... // ... ut dum animae de corporibus exierint, ad illam possint uenire gloriam, per dominum nostrum Iesum Christum. Amen.

11. [95](Herwagen, cols. 500-501. *PL* 94, cols. 498A-498C) DE NATIVITATE

Apparuit benignitas et humanitas saluatoris nostri dei, etc. Benignitas domini nostri apparuit, cum mundum per assumptam humanitatem redimere uenit ... // ... Sed ut digne hanc festiuitatem celebrare possimus, ille nobis suam gratiam praestare dignetur, qui cum patre et filio regnat per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.

12. [96](Herwagen, col. 501. *PL* 94, cols. 498C-498D) AD VINCULA SANCTI PETRI

Notandum est, fratres charissimi, qua de causa celebretur festiuitas sancti Petri a uinculis, scilicet, Kalendis Augusti ... // ... Merito beati Petri apostoli principis apostolorum nostris infirmitatibus plura sanitarum beneficia praestantur, largiente domino.

13. [97](Herwagen, cols. 501-502. *PL* 94, cols. 499A-499D) DE MAIORI LETANIA

Fratres charissimi, dignum est ut audiatis qua de causa litaniae rogationum fuerant inuentae ... // ... ut dignetur nobis dare remissionem peccatorum, et custodiat corpora et animas nostras, qui uiuit et regnat, cum patre et spiritu sancto, per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.

14. [98](Herwagen, cols. 502-503. *PL* 94, cols. 499D-500B) SERMO AD POPULUM

Homo natus de muliere, breui uiuens tempore: et dum uiuit, multas sustinet miseriae, plus amore corporis quam animae. Sed anima non potest mori, sed cum exit de corpore, cito moritur corpus ... // ... ut post hanc uitam mereamur ingredi in ianuas paradisi, quod nobis praestare dignetur Iesus Christus.

15. [99] (Herwagen, cols. 503-504. *PL* 94, cols. 500B-501A) IN DIE CINERUM
 Hodie, fratres charissimi, in pugnam contra diabolum intramus, et debemus illum uincere per totam quadragesimam ... // ... sed pugnemus cum diabolo his quadraginta diebus, ut in die resurrectionis cum domino mereamur habere uitam aeternam.
16. [100] (Herwagen, cols. 504-506. *PL* 94, cols. 501A-502D) ALIUS SERMO
 Dies dominicus, dies electus est, in quo gaudent angeli. Interrogandum est quis primus rogauit ... // ... Nos autem, fratres charissimi, audientes tanta tormenta inferni, conuertamur ad dominum nostrum, ut cum angelis eius ualeamus regnare.
17. [101] (Herwagen, cols. 506-507. *PL* 94, cols. 502D-503B) REVELATIO SANCTI MICHAELIS
 Deus uolens angelos honorari in terra ab hominibus, hanc occasionem, ut legimus, primam ostendit ... // ... ab hoc tempore usque in praesens sunt ecclesiae et festiuitates eorum ad laudem dei, qui uiuit, etc.
18. [59] (Herwagen, cols. 507-509. *PL* 94, cols. 422B-423B) DE SANCTA MARIA
 Hodie, fratres charissimi, celebramus festiuitatem sanctae Mariae, dei genitricis quae hodie translata est in coelum de mundo, ut pro nobis oret filium ... // ... Toto igitur affectu confugiamus ad eam uenire, ut per suas orationes ducat nos ad illa gaudia ubi ipsa manet cum filio sine fine.
19. [102] (Herwagen, cols. 509-510. *PL* 94, cols. 503C-504B) SERMO QUALIBET DIE
 Pius et misericors dominus nos per prophetam hortatur ad compunctionem cordis, et poenitentiam, dicens ... // ... ut in inferno non crucieris, sed habeas gloriam cum deo patre, etc.
20. [103] (Herwagen, cols. 510-511. *PL* 94, cols. 504B-505A) ALIUS SERMO
 Fratres charissimi, tempus est transeundi de malo ad bonum, de tenebris ad lucem ... // ... operemur bonum ad omnes, et mala facere cessemus, ut ad uitam aeternam peruenire ualeamus.
21. [104] (Herwagen, cols. 511-513. *PL* 94, cols. 505B-507A) ALIUS SERMO
Misericordia et ueritas obuiauuerunt sibi, etc. Fuit quidam paterfamilias, rex potens, qui quatuor filias habuit, quarum una uocabatur Misericordia ... // ... ad quod ouile nos perducatur Iesus Christus, cui est honor et gloria in omne aeuum. Amen.
22. [105] (Herwagen, cols. 513-514. *PL* 94, cols. 507A-507C) IN DIE PALMARUM
Cum appropinquasset Iesus Hierosolymam, et uenisset Bethphage, ad montem Oliueti, tunc misit duos discipulos, etc. Intrante articulo suae passionis Christus uenit Hierusalem, propter Adam qui descenderat a Ierusalem in Iericho ... // ... quod ille nobis concedat qui uiuit et regnat deus per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.

Quelques considérations sur l'influence du *De contemplatione* de Richard de Saint-Victor

Jean GROSFILLIER

(Genève)

Richard de Saint-Victor († 1173) est l'un des deux grands auteurs victorins du XII^e siècle qui ont fait autorité en théologie comme en spiritualité, à une période où l'École de Saint-Victor était à son apogée. L'autre est Hugues, qui a précédé Richard dans l'Abbaye et dont la gloire a quelque peu éclipsé celui-ci.

Les notes que nous proposons développent celles que nous avons esquissées dans notre édition du *De contemplatione*¹. Elles ne sauraient traiter cependant de manière exhaustive de l'influence générale de Richard. Sur plusieurs points particuliers celle-ci a d'ailleurs déjà été étudiée soit systématiquement soit par des analyses ponctuelles². Si son *De Trinitate* a retenu

¹ Nous venons d'en établir une nouvelle version sur un manuscrit victorin ancien (Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 769), peut-être le plus proche du texte original de Richard : *L'œuvre de Richard de Saint-Victor I, De contemplatione*, éd. Brepols, Turnhout, 2013, dans la collection *Sous la règle de Saint-Augustin*. Nous l'avons accompagnée de la première traduction française complète. Marc-Aeilko Aris avait déjà donné un texte latin très amélioré en complément de sa thèse (*"Contemplatio", Philosophische Studien zum Traktat Benjamin maior des Richard von St. Victor*, Frankfurt am Main, 1996). Il existe des traductions anglaises et allemande, certaines partielles, mais toutes établies sur le texte de la Patrologie qui est parfois fautif. Nous n'avons pas connaissance de traductions dans d'autres langues. Nous citerons le traité selon notre édition (livres ou parties en chiffres romains, chapitres en chiffres arabes), avec les références à la Patrologie (vol. 196 – indication que nous ne répéterons pas –, colonne et lettre marginale).

² Sur la question de l'influence de Saint-Victor, voir le recueil d'études publié à la suite du colloque international tenu à Paris les 24-27 septembre 2008, *L'École de Saint-Victor de Paris, Influence et Rayonnement du Moyen Âge à l'époque moderne*, éd. D. POIREL, Turnhout, 2010. Sur la postérité de Richard, Jean Châtillon a déjà donné dans le *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, t. 13 (1988), col. 646 à 652, une synthèse sur l'influence exercée par notre Victorin, ainsi qu'une excellente analyse de sa personnalité et de ses œuvres ; on trouve aussi des indications précieuses dans les introductions aux éditions modernes de certaines œuvres, sous la plume de Jean Châtillon, déjà nommé (le *Liber exceptionum* et le *Exiit edictum uel De tribus processionibus*), de Jean Ribaillier (*Opusculs théologiques et De Trinitate*) et de Gervais Dumeige (*De IV gradibus violentae caritatis*) ; on peut se reporter encore aux articles anciens signés par Robert Javelet ; plus récemment ont paru deux ouvrages utiles : *Théologies victorines* (Paris, 2008) de P. SICARD, ainsi que « Figure Vittorine : Riccardo,

et retient encore l'attention des théologiens et des spécialistes de l'histoire du dogme, et si son autre ouvrage sur l'expérience mystique, le *Beniamin minor*, ou *De duodecim patriarchis*, qui est une sorte de préparation à l'approche contemplative des mystères, a bénéficié d'une diffusion remarquable³, le *De contemplatione* en revanche a été moins lu dans les milieux contemplatifs, et son texte parfois difficile d'accès est demeuré réservé à des lecteurs cultivés maîtrisant le latin.

Nous limiterons nos remarques à la postérité du *De contemplatione*.

1. *Remarques générales sur l'accueil du 'De contemplatione' et de Richard de Saint-Victor*

Ce traité a été intitulé de diverses manières au gré des manuscrits et des premières éditions : *De gratia contemplationis*, *De archa mystica*, *De archa Moysi*, ce qui fut source parfois de confusion avec les ouvrages de Hugues de Saint-Victor aux intitulés voisins, comme le *De archa Noe*, appelé aussi *De archa Noe mystica* selon la Patrologie, ou le *Libellus de formatione arche*. Il est aussi connu généralement sous la désignation de *Beniamin maior*, sous-titre que nous utiliserons parfois par commodité⁴. Quant à la présence dans certains intitulés du *De contemplatione* du mot *archa* (*archa mystica* ou *archa Moysi*), elle correspond au titre du premier chapitre : l'arche d'alliance montrée dans une extase à Moïse, selon Richard, a valeur allégorique pour désigner la progression de la connaissance spirituelle allant jusqu'à la saisie des mystères divins. Chaque élément de cette arche (structure, matière) indique une étape. L'arche est non seulement le signe d'une alliance (sens historique), mais elle est aussi une « arche de sanctification » qui, au sens spirituel, suggère les voies d'un perfectionnement.

Ce texte n'a pas toujours reçu l'attention qu'il méritait, bien qu'il fût en Occident le premier traité théorique et systématique sur l'expérience

Acardo e Tommaso », par P. SICARD et D. POIREL, dans *Figure del pensiero medievale*, t. 2 (Milan, 2008).

³ Dans son livre *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke Richards von St. Viktor im Mittelalter*, Turnhout, 2005, p. 250 et 268, Rudolf Goy recensait déjà deux cent vingt-quatre manuscrits pour le *Beniamin minor*, contre quatre-vingt-huit pour le *De contemplatione*, au point que ce chercheur pouvait qualifier le *Beniamin minor* de « Bestseller » et dire (p. 391) : « Von seiner Veröffentlichung an hat dieses "Handbuch zur Kontemplation" eine ungewöhnlich intensive Aufnahme gefunden. »

⁴ Ce complément de titre sert uniquement à le distinguer du *De duodecim patriarchis*, dit le *Beniamin minor*. Au demeurant, la problématique de la contemplation est un thème qui apparaît déjà dans ses ouvrages antérieurs et qui sera repris dans le *De IV gradibus violentae caritatis*. La connaissance spirituelle est une préoccupation constante de Richard ; elle est aussi présente dans son ouvrage plus spécifiquement théologique, le *De Trinitate*.

contemplative et l'extase⁵. Il rassemble et ordonne les données recueillies dans les récits bibliques et les témoignages des Pères de l'Église pour élaborer une analyse et un exposé structuré de la contemplation, partant de l'activité la plus simple que chacun peut connaître, pour décrire par paliers les degrés d'élévation ou les étapes d'une ascèse conduisant à l'expérience extatique suprême. De cette œuvre majeure de Richard de Saint-Victor, on n'a souvent retenu que quelques passages, toujours les mêmes (la division en six genres ou niveaux de contemplation, les définitions de la *contemplatio*, de la *meditatio* et de la *cogitatio*). On l'a interprétée parfois de manière peu satisfaisante : l'idée qu'on se faisait des conceptions du Victorin se fondait sur une lecture partielle du traité, ou se référait à des thèses tirées d'autres ouvrages qu'on lui attribuait à tort et qui venaient troubler l'analyse et fausser l'interprétation⁶ : en lisant le texte de manière fragmentaire ou en se référant à l'*Expositio in Cantica Canticorum* ou à l'*Epistola ad Severinum de gradibus caritatis*, l'une et l'autre que les érudits s'accordent à retirer des œuvres de Richard, on a même prêté au Victorin des thèses qui le rattacheaient au courant de la mystique affective, ce que ses premiers lecteurs, plus attentifs et mieux informés, n'ont jamais soutenu⁷.

Au surplus, dans la quête aux influences exercées par tel ou tel auteur sur les générations suivantes, il reste difficile de discerner dans les textes, spécialement lorsqu'il est question de contemplation, entre ce qui est la reprise directe d'une idée due à une lecture personnelle d'un traité, l'écho de thèmes transmis par d'autres ou qui circulaient de toute façon chez plusieurs auteurs, le souvenir de propos entendus. À moins qu'il ne soit cité nommément, affirmer que Richard est à la source de telle ou telle thèse reste hasardeux. Le Victorin a cherché à établir une synthèse cohérente des expériences décrites avant lui : il est donc lui-même une voie de transmission de certaines notions, non sans apporter néanmoins une réflexion théorique nouvelle qui lui est propre.

Les grands théologiens du XIII^e siècle ont quelque peu occulté Richard de Saint-Victor. On lit celui-ci soit comme inscrit dans la ligne de Denys, ce

⁵ C'est l'avis d'un spécialiste de la littérature médiévale, Kurt Ruh, qui écrit, dans *Geschichte der abendländischen Mystik* (Munich, 1990-1999, Band I), p. 405 : « Richards Analysen der Ekstase sind die ersten des Abendlandes, die den Namen "Lehre" verdienen. »

⁶ Sur cette question de l'authenticité et notamment sur les pseudépigraphes, on peut consulter utilement R. GOY, *op. cit.* (n. 3, *supra*), p. 382-388.

⁷ On peut lire encore dans des ouvrages récents la thèse de la prédominance de l'affectif sur le cognitif chez Richard fondée sur des études anciennes qui se référaient aux pseudépigraphes. Cf. par exemple É.-H. WÉBER, *Albert le Grand, Commentaire de la « Théologie mystique » de Denys le pseudo-aréopagite*, Paris, 1993, p. 16-17. Il est suivi par T.-D. HUMBRECHT dans *Théologie négative et Noms divins chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, 2005, p. 337, n. 3.

qui est très contestable, soit comme repris par les scolastiques qui auraient donné une forme aboutie, pense-t-on, à ce qui n'était encore peut-être chez le Victorin qu'une première tentative de théoriser la contemplation. En conséquence on s'est progressivement contenté de ne citer que les parties les plus accessibles de son traité, sans reprendre ses diverses approches pour éclairer l'expérience mystique la plus élevée. Les lecteurs intéressés par la théologie de la contemplation ont été tentés de voir surtout chez Thomas d'Aquin et Bonaventure ceux qu'ils pensaient avoir réussi à établir une synthèse « scientifique » (au sens où l'entendaient les scolastiques du XIII^e siècle), reléguant Richard à l'arrière-plan, comme un prédécesseur encore mal équipé pour une analyse formellement et solidement constituée. Ce d'autant que la place qu'occupe de plus en plus Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite tend aussi à marginaliser le Victorin.

Nous ne considérerons ici qu'une postérité proche de Richard de Saint-Victor : des auteurs du XIII^e siècle qui le mentionnent explicitement et prennent position par rapport à lui. Même s'ils ne l'ont pas toujours approuvé et suivi, il est suffisamment important à leurs yeux pour qu'ils le citent et le commentent parfois. Nous examinerons donc l'influence exercée sur Thomas Gallus qui est peut-être le premier à infléchir nettement les thèses sur la contemplation extatique vers celles de Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite ; saint Bonaventure qui a suivi Thomas Gallus dans l'orientation dionysienne et qui s'est surtout inspiré de Richard pour plusieurs aspects de la théologie de la Trinité ; saint Thomas d'Aquin considéré comme une autorité en théologie ; Hugues de Balma dont la *Théologie mystique* prend expressément ses distances avec Richard, tel du moins qu'il a cru le comprendre ; Guigues du Pont comme exemple d'un lecteur de Richard qui le cite mais ne le suit guère. Dans une dernière partie, nous nous arrêterons plus particulièrement au cas de Dante Alighieri qui fait un éloge de Richard dont on n'a pas toujours reconnu qu'il pouvait cacher l'aveu d'une communauté de pensée sur la contemplation extatique. Ce choix est bien sûr limitatif et laisse de côté d'autres auteurs qui mériteraient aussi un examen, mais qui sont peut-être moins directement et manifestement influencés par le Victorin (nous pensons à Guillaume d'Auvergne et à quelques autres que nous mentionnerons d'ailleurs plus loin).

Ce sera aussi l'occasion d'une sorte de relecture de Richard en le confrontant à ceux qui l'ont suivi plus ou moins fidèlement, une manière de mieux l'éclairer par contraste et, si possible, de le faire connaître un peu mieux. Par la force des choses, nous serons appelé parfois à nous répéter, les mêmes arguments et les mêmes références servant à comparer les thèses ricardiennes et celles de ses successeurs.

2. Réception au XIII^e siècle

a. Thomas Gallus

L'abbé de Verceil († 1246) fut d'abord chanoine régulier à Saint-Victor de Paris. Vers les années 1218-1219, sur appel, il se rendit avec des confrères à Verceil, dans le Piémont, pour y fonder une abbaye, d'où l'épithète qui accompagne souvent son nom (*Vercellensis*). L'influence de l'École victorine de Paris a fortement marqué son œuvre. Nous intéressent ici plus spécialement les rapports qu'on peut établir entre cette œuvre et celle de Richard. Thomas a lu les ouvrages de son aîné, les a admirés et s'en est inspiré. Il se réfère explicitement à lui dans ses traités sur la contemplation, notamment dans son commentaire sur la *Théologie mystique* de Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite⁸, où il déclare emprunter à Richard la division en six genres. Les trois premiers genres, nous dit-il, s'occupent des propriétés sensibles, de la nature cachée, des raisons, de l'ordre, des causes des choses visibles, etc. ; le quatrième, en se passant du concours de l'imagination, vise tout ce que celle-ci ne peut atteindre ; le cinquième s'élève jusqu'aux spectacles divins et éternels que l'intellect peut appréhender (tout ce qui s'offre donc des mystères divins par la Révélation, accepté par la foi, accessible à la compréhension humaine et ne répugnant pas à la raison) ; le sixième est complètement ignoré de la philosophie humaine dont les spéculations s'appuient sur les données rationnelles⁹. On reconnaît là aisément les divisions proposées par Richard, sauf en ce qui concerne les cinquième et sixième genres, où Thomas Gallus établit une séparation totale entre eux, le sixième genre ne comportant en définitive aucune activité de l'intelligence¹⁰. L'influence diionysienne se manifeste nettement et entraîne une orientation qui s'éloigne

⁸ *"Explanatio super mysticam theologiam", Kommentar zur Mystischen Theologie und andere Schriften*, J. VAHLKAMPF, édit., Dollnstein, 2001

⁹ *Explanatio*, p. 2: « Ut enim docet prior Richardus in distinctione graduum contemplationis, primus gradus et secundus et tertius versantur circa visibilia sensibiles proprietates et invisibiles naturas, rationes, ordines, causas etc. [...] Quartus gradus 'semoto imaginationis officio' illis solis intendit quae imaginatio non attingit [...] Quintus assurgit in divina et aeterna spectacula tantum intellectu apprehensibilia et humanae rationi consona. Sextum philosophia humana ignorat. » Les mots *semoto imaginationis officio* sont ceux du traité de Richard (I, 6, p. 106, l. 52-53 [71B]).

¹⁰ Richard dit que l'intelligence est active à ce niveau (I, 3, p. 94, l. 38-41 [67B]): « Per intelligentiam siquidem sinus mentis in immensum expanditur, et contemplantis animi acies acuitur, ut capax sit ad multa comprehendenda, et perspicax ad subtilia penetranda. » Ou encore (IV, 23, p. 468, l. 34-37 [167B]): « In illo sane speculamur inuisibilia nostra, in isto contemplamur inuisibilia diuina. Sed hunc utrumque statum, unum uidelicet omnibus notum, alterum autem paucis expertum, diuidit et secludit densum obliuionis uelum. » L'intelligence peut être commune (mêlée intimement de raison), c'est l'état que désigne *in illo*, où elle contemple les profondeurs de l'âme humaine ; elle peut devenir pure et simple (c'est l'état désigné par *in isto*), dépassant les images et le raisonnement logique, pour se déployer sous

sensiblement des positions de Richard. Il est un autre traité intitulé *Spectacula contemplationis*¹¹, où la comparaison des degrés pourrait laisser le sentiment d'un accord assez général avec la description qu'en donne le traité de Richard. Thomas Gallus cite la définition ricardienne de la contemplation qu'on peut lire en I, 4, définition très générale et qui est loin de renseigner sur l'ensemble de la doctrine ricardienne de l'extase¹². Il se réfère aussi, en ouverture, aux six degrés du *De contemplatione*, mais il subdivise alors systématiquement chaque degré en sept considérations, ce qui s'éloigne des subdivisions ricardiennes qui ne présentent pas de schéma aussi rigide, mais répondent à des observations psychologiques plus nuancées. Mais il est clair pour le Vercellien qu'il ne s'agit, aux degrés cinq et six, que d'une contemplation située dans un ordre intellectuel encore en deçà de l'expérience extatique¹³. Richard, en revanche, considère que *l'alienatio mentis* qui marque l'expérience suprême, celle du sixième genre, permet d'aborder des « connaissances » qui sont tout à fait en dehors de l'exercice des ressources rationnelles, et qui se situent dans un au-delà de l'esprit humain (différent même de ce que la notion de *supra*, d'élévation au-dessus de l'humain, peut suggérer); mais on est encore dans une « expérience connaissante »¹⁴. Le *Spectacula contemplationis* cependant est trop sommaire pour faire apparaître et éclairer toutes les divergences entre les deux conceptions. C'est, après l'*Explanatio*, dans les *Commentaires du Cantique des Cantiques*¹⁵ qu'il faut encore aller chercher l'option choisie par Thomas. Dans ce dernier ouvrage, le Vercellien aligne son exposé sur la hiérarchie angélique selon le modèle dionysien (trois ordres, subdivisés à leur tour chacun en trois), où ce sont les séraphins qui représentent la contemplation suprême, com-

l'effet de la grâce ou de la révélation des mystères, et accéder à la compréhension de certains mystères divins, expérience extatique réservée à un petit nombre.

¹¹ « *Spectacula contemplationis* (1244-46): A treatise by Thomas Gallus », éd. et prés. par D. LAWELL dans *Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales*, LXXVI.2 (2009), p. 249-285.

¹² *De contemplatione*, p. 96, l. 5-6 [67D]: « Contemplatio est libera mentis perspicacia in sapientiae spectacula, cum admiratione suspensa. » Il n'est pas encore question ici d'*alienatio*, d'*ebrietas* et de *spiritualium deliciarum affluentia* (*iocunditas, exultatio*) qui seront les caractéristiques des divers niveaux de l'extase, laquelle est propre aux genres supérieurs de contemplation, sauf exception, comme le dit Richard lui-même (IV, 22, p. 460, l. 4-8 [164C]: « Quamuis autem [...] quasi proprium uideatur duobus nouissimis contemplationum generibus [i. e. quinto et sexto] per mentis excessum uidere, econtra autem, quattuor primis [...] sine ulla animi alienatione in contemplationem assurgere possunt, tamen omnia atque solent modo utroque contingere. »

¹³ Cf. *Spectacula contemplationis*, op. cit., p. 255: « Hec est descriptio contemplationis intellectualis citra mentis excessum. »

¹⁴ Nous reviendrons plus loin sur les caractéristiques de cette « connaissance » supérieure.

¹⁵ *Commentaires du Cantique des Cantiques*, texte critique, introd., notes et tables, par J. BARBET, Paris, 1967.

plètement distingués du niveau des chérubins, ce qui nous éloigne encore plus de Richard¹⁶. Mais l'essentiel qu'il faut souligner réside dans le recours, pour le dernier degré de contemplation, à la notion nouvelle d'une « puissance cognitive » qui excède l'intelligence, c'est-à-dire la *principalis affectio*, qu'il appelle aussi la *scintilla synderesis*, seule capable de s'unir à l'Esprit divin¹⁷. Cette contemplation, à ce niveau, n'est plus qu'une union avec la divin, une dilatation et une pénétration superintellectuelle accessible au seul *principalis affectus*¹⁸; ou, comme il le dit dans l'*Explanatio*, en un passage qui se place résolument sous l'inspiration de Denys: « En ce livre [la *Théologie mystique*], Denys a présenté une autre manière incomparablement plus profonde, superintellectuelle et supersubstantielle, de connaître Dieu. Le philosophe païen ne la connut pas, car il ne la chercha pas et ne pensa pas qu'elle existât; il ne découvrit pas la puissance sur laquelle se fonde cette connaissance dans l'âme. Il estima que la puissance cognitive la plus haute réside en l'intellect, alors qu'il en est une autre qui ne dépasse pas moins l'intellect que celui-ci ne dépasse la raison, ou celle-ci, l'imagination, à savoir l'affection principale, elle-même la *scintilla synderesis*, qui seule peut s'unir à l'Esprit divin¹⁹. » Si la philosophie est désignée explici-

¹⁶ Dans le *De contemplatione* de Richard, les degrés supérieurs de l'expérience contemplative (connaissance de l'Unité et de la Trinité divines) sont symbolisés par les deux chérubins de l'arche d'alliance. Ce choix significatif s'imposait au moins pour deux raisons: les chérubins font partie de l'arche telle que décrite par Moïse et donc intrinsèquement de l'allégorie qu'exploite Richard; leur nom « signifie » pour les Pères de l'Église la *plénitude de la science*, et donc, comme le dit Richard, « il convient sans doute de prêter une vive attention à [leur] description » (p. 376, l. 9 [135B]).

¹⁷ L'expression « puissance cognitive » s'autorise des premières lignes du prologue au Commentaire, glosant le verset de Jérémie 9: « *In hoc gloriatur qui gloriatur scire et nosse me, etc.* Duplex hic designatur Dei cognitio, una intellectualis [...] alia autem est Dei cognitio que istam incomparabiliter excedit ... » (voir éd. BARBET, p. 65); *scire* et *nosse* correspondraient donc à deux formes de « connaissance » du divin, l'une intellectuelle, l'autre supraintellectuelle. L'expression se lit aussi dans le passage cité ci-après, n. 19.

¹⁸ *Troisième commentaire, prologus interpolatus*, éd. BARBET, p. 115: « Superintellectuales extensiones et immissiones [...] solus principalis affectus. »

¹⁹ *Explanatio*, p. 2-3: « In hoc autem libro [i. e. *Theologia mystica*] alium incomparabiliter profundiorum modum cognoscendi Deum [Dionysius] tradidit, id est superintellectualem et supersubstantialem quem ideo philosophus gentilis non apprehendit, quia non quaesivit, nec esse putavit nec vim secundum quam fundatur in anima deprehendit. Putavit enim summam vim cognitivam esse intellectum, cum sit alia, quae non minus excedit intellectum quam intellectus rationem, vel ratio imaginationem, scilicet principalis affectio; et ipsa est scintilla synderesis, quae sola unibilis est Spiritui divino ... » Hugues de Balma citera ce passage, à quelques mots près, dans *Théologie mystique*, t. II, p. 146-147 (cf. *infra*, n. 53). On notera que chez Richard la notion d'union n'est pas présente formellement; seules apparaissent des formes de fusion par transformation de l'esprit, ce qu'on a appelé parfois une « divinisation »; *unus* n'est induit que par la citation de *I Cor.* 6, 17 (deux fois). Ce qui domine c'est la notion de « transformation », inspirée par *II Cor.* 3, 18, qui revient à plusieurs reprises (quatre

tement, la remarque vise aussi, sans que cela soit dit – soit par déférence pour un illustre prédécesseur encore admiré, soit parce que celui-ci était déjà mal compris –, la conception ricardienne à laquelle on reproche de ne pas se détacher complètement de ces voies intellectuelles²⁰.

Avec Thomas Gallus s'opère un tournant qui va marquer fortement une grande partie de la littérature mystique jusqu'à nos jours²¹. Le détachement de la mystique hors des catégories de la connaissance rationnelle – assimilée d'ailleurs à l'activité intellectuelle en général (*intelligentia* ou *intellectus*) –, qui entraîne un rôle accru des expressions désignant un fond qui se situe au-delà, dans une zone de l'affectif, « s'accomplit pour ainsi dire sous nos yeux chez Thomas Gallus²² ». Mais il faut prendre garde aux mots : si Richard décrit lui aussi un dépassement de la connaissance rationnelle, c'est pour suggérer qu'il y a une connaissance supérieure qui conduit à un savoir auquel les seules démarches de la raison ne peuvent aboutir, mais qui s'appuie sur une lumière spirituelle, illumination de la grâce et révélation divine dira-t-il, intuition intérieure diront d'autres.

b. Bonaventure

Saint Bonaventure († 1274) est peut-être l'auteur qui a lu le plus attentivement les thèses de Richard de Saint-Victor. Plus que d'autres, il y a trouvé une source d'inspiration et a cherché à concilier l'approche ricardienne avec les développements scolastiques de son temps et les éléments de la théologie mystique de Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite. On cite volontiers cette déclaration, dans le *De reductione artium ad theologiam*, 5 (éd. Quaracchi, t. 5, p. 321) : « Richardus sequitur Dionysium. » Jean Châtillon pense que cette affirmation trahit l'influence de Thomas Gallus qui a peut-être orienté la lecture des œuvres de Richard dans le sens d'une filiation étroite

occurrences) ; ou qui transparaît dans d'autres passages comme en IV, 15 (*infusio*, p. 428, l. 39 [153C] et *infusio – liquescere*, l. 55-56 [153D], ou encore en V, 9 (p. 532, l. 26 [178C] ; *transformatio*, p. 534, l. 34-35 et *mutatio*, 39-40 [178D]).

²⁰ La mention du philosophe païen fait référence à Aristote, mais peut aussi désigner toute philosophie qui procède par les seules voies de la rationalité. Mais comme cette mention vient après une description des cinq degrés inspirée par Richard, on voit bien que ce dernier est écarté au même titre que les philosophes.

²¹ Il est certes vrai que la voie affective était déjà mise en valeur par saint Bernard, mais c'est en tant que théoricien que Thomas Gallus préconise cette voie.

²² E. von IVÁNKA, « Plato Christianus », *La réception critique du platonisme chez les Pères de l'Église*, Paris, 1990, p. 323. Il nous semble d'ailleurs que les deux ouvrages d'un Pseudo-Richard mentionnés plus haut (*l'Expositio in Cantica Canticorum* et *l'Epistola ad Severinum de gradibus caritatis*) sont déjà marqués par cette évolution que signale Endre von Ivánka, ce qui confirmerait qu'ils ne sont pas de Richard, et probablement postérieurs, Gervais Dumeige ayant définitivement attribué *l'Épître à Séverin* à un certain Ives (cf. l'édition qu'il a procurée de ce texte, à Paris, en 1956, p. 20-25).

avec Denys. À proprement parler, il n'y a pas de filiation, sinon sous la forme de la reprise de termes qui ont passé par le commentaire de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Richard est surtout augustinien, avec tout ce que l'évêque d'Hippone a pu lui transmettre d'influences grecques. Il ne suit pas Denys, si l'on entend par là qu'il s'inspirerait directement des textes dionysiens. Il ne cite d'ailleurs expressément que la *Hiérarchie céleste* dans l'*Expositio super Apocalypsim*, sans la reprendre ensuite dans le *De duodecim patriarchis* ni dans le *De contemplatione*²³.

Il n'est pas question ici d'examiner l'ensemble des rapprochements possibles entre saint Bonaventure et Richard et l'influence de celui-ci sur le docteur séraphique²⁴. Une excellente étude de Markus Brun a largement exploré avec beaucoup de pertinence les rapports entre la pensée bonaventurienne et celle du Victorin. Elle fournit en outre un appareil très riche de références aux études déjà consacrées à cette question, autant sur le plan de la théologie de la Trinité que sur celui de la connaissance spirituelle et extatique²⁵. De surcroît, il faudrait aborder préalablement, dans la recherche des influences exercées par Richard, les auteurs qui, outre Thomas Gallus, ont été des intermédiaires comme Alexandre Halès et Antoine de Padoue, étude qui exigerait une monographie spécifique. Nous nous contenterons de remarques sur certains points de la doctrine bonaventurienne plus directement en rapport avec le *De contemplatione* de Richard, en laissant de côté tout ce qui touche à la Trinité.

L'*Itinerarium mentis in Deum* de saint Bonaventure est considéré généralement comme l'œuvre exprimant le mieux la pensée bonaventurienne sur la contemplation des mystères divins²⁶. Sur plusieurs points, il présente des parentés avec le traité de Richard. Il y est question de six degrés dans la

²³ Il utilise aussi deux ou trois termes empruntés à la *Hiérarchie céleste*, soit directement, soit à travers le commentaire de Hugues de Saint-Victor ou la traduction de Jean Scot : quelques occurrences de *supermundanus*, et isolément, *superexcellencia*, *anagoge*, *theophania* (mots qui sont peut-être venus d'autres sources), sans que nous y voyions une véritable influence sur sa pensée. Ce sont termes qui permettent d'exprimer de manière heureuse des concepts pour lesquels le latin n'avait pas de mot tout à fait adéquat.

²⁴ Pour les études consacrées expressément à ce sujet, mais qui sont déjà anciennes, mentionnons R. JAVELET, « Saint Bonaventure et Richard de Saint Victor », in *Bonaventuriana, Miscellanea in onore di J.G. Bougerol*, a cura di F. de Asis Chavero Blanco, Roma 1988, Vol. I, 63-96 ; F. ANDRES, « Die Stufen der Contemplatio in Bonaventuras Itinerarium mentis in Deum und im Benjamin maior des Richard v. St. Viktor », in *Franziskanische Studien* 8 (1921), 189-200.

²⁵ M. BRUN, « *Actus purus principii caritative diligentis* », *Trinitarische Theologie bei Bonaventura und ihr Ursprung bei Dionysius Pseudo-Areopagita und Richard von St.-Victor*, Munich, 2005.

²⁶ *Itinéraire de l'esprit vers Dieu*, texte latin de Quaracchi, introduction, traduction et notes par H. DUMÉRY, Paris, 2001.

progression vers la connaissance extatique. Mais cette analogie reste assez superficielle, car l'examen détaillé montre que Bonaventure envisage ces étapes de manière différente, si on les compare aux degrés (ou genres) de contemplation selon Richard²⁷. Les six degrés de la contemplation correspondent chez Bonaventure à trois actes contemplatifs portant sur ce qui est hors de nous (le monde créé), ce qui est en nous (mémoire, intelligence, volonté), ce qui est au-dessus de nous (la transcendance divine comme unité et comme trinité). Chacun de ces trois actes est subdivisé selon un double mouvement ascendant et descendant : le regard se porte vers l'objet contemplé et par lui monte jusqu'à Dieu ; il revient ensuite contempler l'effet de l'action divine, etc. ; d'où la désignation de chaque subdivision en *per* et *in*. Le chiffre six est en fait repris des six jours de la Création. Certes, chez Richard, les six genres comportent aussi d'abord une contemplation du monde créé, mais ensuite, ce qui les distingue est autant sinon plus que l'objet (chaque genre pouvant s'appliquer au même objet), la manière dont l'activité mentale met en jeu soit les images, soit le raisonnement discursif, soit encore l'intelligence comme puissance supérieure qui est déjà un début de sagesse illuminée par la grâce.

Plus intéressant est le rapprochement qu'on peut faire avec les chapitres cinq et six de l'*Itinerarium*, où le docteur séraphique reprend l'image de l'arche avec les deux chérubins, l'un signifiant la contemplation de l'Unité, l'autre celle de la Trinité chez Richard, celle de la Trinité dans son fondement le Bien chez Bonaventure. Chez le Victorin, ce double regard de l'âme, comme celui des chérubins, se tourne vers le mystère de l'Union du divin et de l'humain dans le Christ (que symbolise le propitiatoire). La contemplation va atteindre ensuite le degré suprême, nous dit Richard, au prix d'une transformation de notre esprit sous l'effet de l'illumination divine. Pour le docteur franciscain, en revanche, c'est le dernier degré accessible à notre compréhension en l'état de passage en cette vie et en fonction de nos possibilités mentales²⁸. Il fait en outre référence au Christ rédempteur qui devient l'objet principal de la contemplation. Il introduit ensuite un sep-

²⁷ On notera que Bonaventure ne parle jamais de *contemplationis genera* (expression caractéristique du traité victorin), alors que les équivalents qu'il emploie (*modi* et surtout *gradi*) sont parfois présents chez Richard. Il ne cite pas non plus le nom de Richard dans l'*Itinerarium* (cette absence n'est pas en soi très significative selon les usages de l'époque, mais si le Victorin était nommément désigné dans ce traité, comme il l'est par exemple par saint Thomas d'Aquin, cela prendrait un relief particulier). En revanche, Denys est expressément nommé.

²⁸ *Itin. mentis*, VII, 1 (éd. DUMÉRY, p.100) : « ... secundum quod possibile est secundum statum viae et exercitium mentis nostrae. »

tième degré. L'esprit, dépassant le monde intelligible et l'âme elle-même²⁹, par l'effet des vertus théologiques, de la dévotion, de l'admiration, de l'exultation, de la vénération, de la louange et de la jubilation (vocabulaire que nous trouvons déjà en grande partie chez Richard), s'avance au-delà, autant qu'il est possible en cette vie, dans une sorte de repos en Dieu, comme le Christ au tombeau. C'est l'expérience vécue par saint François d'Assise, qui « passa en Dieu par un dépassement de la contemplation³⁰. » « Il faut que toutes les opérations de l'intelligence soient abandonnées et que le point culminant tout entier de l'affectivité (l'*apex affectus totus*) soit transporté et transformé en Dieu³¹. » Aller plus loin dans l'analyse de cette formule assez elliptique n'est pas possible en ce lieu³².

²⁹ *Ibidem* : « Restat ut haec [mens] speculando transcendat et transeat non solum mundum istum sensibilem, verum etiam semetipsam. »

³⁰ *Idem*, VII, 3 (p. 102) : « [Franciscus] in Deum transiit per contemplationis excessum. » Nous nous en sommes tenu à un mot à mot qui peut paraître maladroit, mais qui se veut respectueux du texte. Nous n'avons pas voulu traduire par « extase » pour éviter toute confusion avec le *mentis excessus* dont use Richard, qui ne correspond pas exactement avec le degré supérieur que conçoit Bonaventure, lequel ajoute qu'on a affaire en ce cas à une contemplation en sa perfection, pour dire qu'il s'agit de quelque chose de plus que ce dont il a parlé aux deux derniers des six degrés. Henry Duméry traduit : « Il passa en Dieu dans le transport de l'extase. »

³¹ *Idem*, VII, 4 (p. 102) : « In hoc autem transitu, si sit perfectus, oportet quod relinquantur omnes intellectuales operationes, et apex affectus totus transferatur et transformetur in Deum. »

³² Le vocabulaire devrait être soumis à un examen critique permettant de délimiter les écarts de sens ou les points de rencontre avec les mêmes mots qu'utilise Richard (par exemple : *intellectualis, excessus*). Plus généralement, nous touchons au problème du passage de l'activité intellectuelle à l'expérience affective, et de la nature de ces facultés qui sont des propriétés de l'âme, inséparables de sa substance, mais peut-être distinctes dans leurs manifestations, des formes que prendrait cette substance, selon Hugues de Saint-Victor (cf. *De Sacramentis*, I, III, 25 [PL 176, 227B] : « ... quasi affectiones quaedam et formae ipsius [mentis]... »). Chez Richard apparaît nettement un lien étroit entre l'affectivité et la connaissance, celle-là accompagnant celle-ci soit comme effet délectable, soit comme impulsion désirante. Le désir de connaître est un élément nécessaire et stimulant (« debemus [...] uehementi desiderio anhelare » [IV, 10; 145C]) ; il entraîne une *delectatio*, nourrie des *deliciae* pressenties ou déjà ressenties ; l'expérience contemplative elle-même provoque l'admiration et l'exultation (*iocunditas*, dit-il en plusieurs lieux). Ces sentiments de l'ordre de l'affectif, tout à fait épurés et sublimés, sont une forme d'*amor* (ou de *caritas*), mais c'est la lumière divine qui transforme l'âme elle-même pour qu'elle accède à la joie de la connaissance. Il n'est pas étonnant que les victorins parlent si souvent de l'œil du cœur, pour le regard qui connaît les mystères (cf. à ce sujet les pages rassemblées par Patrice Sicard, dans *Hugues de Saint-Victor et son École*, Turnhout, 1991, p. 238 à 251). Pour Bonaventure, il y a un amour qui doit entraîner à l'union avec le divin (on reconnaît ici l'influence dionysienne), celui de l'amour du Christ crucifié. La méditation sur l'exemple du Christ est le « moteur » de cette montée vers l'extase. Mais il s'agit là d'un autre débat qu'il faudrait poursuivre en liaison avec une relecture du *De IV gradibus violentae caritatis* de Richard, ce qui nous entraînerait trop loin. Pour toute

Les puissances de l'âme sont schématiquement réparties en six par Bonaventure (*Itin.* I, 6) : *sensus*, *imaginatio*, *ratio*, *intellectus*, *intelligentia* et *apex mentis seu scintilla synderesis*³³. Chez Richard elles sont clairement divisées en trois (*imaginatio*, *ratio*, *intelligentia*). Elles sont davantage considérées dans leur unité foncière, de degré en degré, avec une plus ou moins grande présence de la raison à côté de l'imagination, ou de l'intelligence associée à la raison raisonnante. Les sens ne sont pour Richard que des instruments de contact avec le monde physique et visible ou perceptible, grâce auxquels l'esprit recueille des images qu'il conserve dans sa mémoire, qu'il contemple, sur lesquelles il fonde de nouvelles images associées ou inventées par similitude, que le raisonnement peut exploiter, soit pour en comprendre les raisons, soit pour découvrir d'autres réalités ; la raison elle-même se libérant des images peut à son tour découvrir d'autres réalités à partir de l'expérience de ce qu'elle découvre à l'intérieur d'elle-même. Ce même esprit, qui imagine et qui raisonne, comprend par l'intelligence, laquelle est une sorte de degré supérieur de la pensée ou mieux, un pouvoir supérieur qui peut soit éclairer l'imagination, soit soutenir la raison, soit encore se servir de celle-ci et la dépasser pour aller au-delà³⁴. Ce pouvoir supérieur en effet reçoit lui-même une lumière qui lui vient sous la forme d'une grâce illuminante, une sorte d'*inspiratio divina* qui agit simultanément comme *aspiratio*, tirant en quelque sorte l'*intelligentia* vers le haut. Plus celle-ci se libère, c'est-à-dire se purifie, plus elle se rend disponible à l'accueil d'une illumination divine, plus elle est capable d'être transformée.

cette problématique et pour les analogies en matière de théologie trinitaire, nous ne pouvons que renvoyer à l'exposé de Markus Brun, déjà mentionné. Nous ne signalerons ici, parmi toute la littérature consacrée à ces questions, que l'ouvrage d'Étienne Gilson, *La philosophie de saint Bonaventure* (Paris, 1953, rééd. 2003), qui analyse (p. 370-378) la notion d'extase et définit ce qu'elle peut être (p. 372), dans la suite de Denys et de Guillaume de Saint-Thierry : « une étreinte dans les ténèbres d'un bien dont la pensée n'atteint pas l'être... », en prenant nettement position sur la question de la « connaissance de Dieu ». Nous citons cette définition qui est bien sûr en arrière-plan de ce que dit Étienne Gilson à propos de Dante et qui, à ce titre, nous intéresse particulièrement (voir *infra*, n. 99).

³³ *Itin. mentis* I, 6 (p. 32) : « Iuxta igitur sex gradus ascensionis in Deum sex sunt gradus potentiarum ab imis ad summa, ab exterioribus ad intima, a temporalibus conscendimus ad aeterna, scilicet sensus, imaginatio, ratio, intellectus, intelligentia et apex mentis seu synderesis. »

³⁴ On notera en passant que l'*intelligentia* est un terme qu'utilise saint Thomas d'Aquin pour désigner les anges. Cf., par ex., *Summa Th.* I^a, q. 50 a. 1 ad 2 : « Dicitur ergo Angelus substantia semper mobilis, quia semper est actu intelligens, non quandoque actu et quandoque potentia, sicut nos. » Richard de Saint-Victor conçoit aussi le niveau supérieur de l'intelligence comme analogue à celui des anges : une sorte d'« angélisation » de l'intelligence humaine est nécessaire, ou une divinisation, selon l'idée que l'« intelligence angélique » est la plus proche de l'intelligence divine. Voir plus loin, à propos de Dante, p. 267, en particulier la note 107.

On ne passe pas dans un état où s'exercerait une autre puissance (la *synderesis* par exemple), mais l'intelligence elle-même subit une transformation. Pour bien comprendre la pensée du Victorin, il ne faut pas seulement lire ce qu'il s'efforce de présenter sous la forme de catégories, pour les besoins de l'exposé³⁵, mais se souvenir aussi que pour lui la pensée est une, avec des degrés de développement divers. Il ne faut pas s'en tenir aux pages où il expose « théoriquement » les genres de contemplation, en se servant de termes techniques comme *supra*, *praeter*, *contra rationem*, mais prendre aussi en compte les images et les exemples bibliques qu'il invoque. L'intelligence humaine, dit-il, est comme l'aurore, une lumière qui sort de la nuit (la nuit des inconnues ou des connaissances limitées, impures, encore entachées de réminiscences terrestres) et qui est progressivement nourrie par la lumière du soleil, c'est-à-dire devient au prix d'un détachement de tout souvenir du monde créé et sous l'effet de la grâce, une intelligence purifiée et simple, capable de comprendre ce qui est naturellement hors de portée de la pensée discursive ordinaire. Cette intelligence est transformée, transfigurée par l'illumination divine, elle est encore une intelligence mais quasiment « divinisée »³⁶. Les exemples d'extases que Richard lit à travers les récits bibliques permettent également de comprendre ce qui se passe dans l'âme en contemplation. Lorsque, dans la vallée de Mambré (*Genèse*, 18), Abraham voit les trois êtres célestes qui viennent le visiter³⁷, il sort de lui-même (c'est le moment défini par l'expression *praeter rationem*) et il voit Dieu, il est entré dans un au-delà de la Création, dans le monde divin : on ne sait si c'est avec son corps ou sans son corps, comme le dira saint Paul après son extase (*II Cor.* 12. 2-3), ou dans l'esprit comme le dira saint Jean dans le prologue de l'*Apocalypse* (*Apoc.* I, 10), ou hors de son esprit comme la reine de Saba (*III Reg.* 10, 5)³⁸. Abraham a connu deux expériences : dans l'une, il voit (le verbe est à prendre en un sens transcen-

³⁵ La première partie dans ses chapitres 3 à 9, qui sont comme un résumé préparatoire à l'usage des lecteurs pressés.

³⁶ V, 9, p. 534, l. 35-39 (178D) : « Et sicut matutina lux crescendo desinit, non quidem esse lux, sed esse lux matutina, ut ipsa aurora iam non sit aurora, ita humana intelligentia ex dilatationis sue magnitudine quandoque accipit ut ipsa iam non sit ipsa, non quidem ut non sit intelligentia, sed ut iam non sit humana. »

³⁷ On y reconnaît aussi une analogie avec les trois personnes qui apparaissent lors de la Transfiguration dans le récit évangélique.

³⁸ Cf. *De contemplatione*, V, 12 (p. 542, l. 45-62 [181D-182C]), où Richard s'interroge sur le sens à donner aux deux manières dont l'expérience de Jean et celle de la reine de Saba sont décrites, et termine en essayant de concilier les deux formules, tout en reconnaissant qu'il y a là quelque chose qui dépasse la compréhension ordinaire, dont l'explication ne peut provenir que de gens plus savants que lui (*idem*, p. 544, l. 83-84 [82C]) : « In spiritu itaque est, qui summum mentis ascendit, et quasi a suo spiritu deficit, qui summum mentis transcendit. Sed hec melius eruditioribus animis plenius discutienda relinquamus. »

dant, c'est une vision avec le regard intérieur, toute référence à la vision physique risque de réduire à la mesure ordinaire ce qui est extraordinaire) et peut rapporter cette vision dans son souvenir en la comprenant avec des termes de l'expression humaine rationnelle (c'était quelque chose qui était *praeter*, mais pas *contra*, comme l'unité divine par exemple, son incommensurabilité); dans l'autre, ce qu'il voit est totalement hors de portée de son esprit humain, et il ne peut ramener dans sa conscience ce qu'il a vu, mais seulement le souvenir d'avoir reçu connaissance d'une réalité appartenant à l'incompréhensibilité divine et qui lui était présente lors de cette extase, mais qu'il ne peut redire.

Lorsqu'on confronte la pensée des auteurs ayant théorisé sur l'expérience contemplative avec celle de Richard, on se rend compte que le sens des mots subit des variations qui rendent les comparaisons problématiques. Pour rendre justice à Richard, il faut bien sûr comprendre les concepts qu'il emploie au sens qu'il leur donne, mais le moyen le plus sûr est de ne pas laisser de côté les pages où la métaphore, le sens allégorique des textes inspirés, lui fournissent des instruments pour se faire entendre.

c. *Thomas d'Aquin*

Entre Richard de Saint-Victor et saint Thomas d'Aquin (1224/1225-1274), les convergences sont nombreuses dans la manière d'analyser la contemplation. Notons d'abord que tous deux s'inspirent d'une manière générale principalement de saint Augustin et de saint Grégoire le Grand³⁹. Le docteur angélique lui-même mentionne expressément le *De contemplatione* dans la *Somme théologique*⁴⁰. En I^a-II^{ac}, q. 180, a. 3, il rapporte *grosso modo* les définitions ricardiennes de la *cogitatio*, de la *meditatio*, et cite textuellement celle de la *contemplatio* que Richard reprend en fait de Hugues de Saint-Victor. Plus loin il évoque les genres (art. 4) et il reprend (art. 6) l'image des mouvements des oiseaux et donne sa propre conception.

Mais on pourrait aussi déceler une présence significative des thèses ricardiennes dans d'autres passages sous forme d'écho, d'allusion, voire de citation non explicite. Nous relèverons, à titre d'exemple frappant, ce texte de la *Somme*, définissant en quelque sorte la contemplation la plus élevée: « ...

³⁹ Sans doute plus que de Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite, même si saint Thomas, termine l'exposé des diverses objections, dans q. 180, a. 6, par ces mots: « In contrarium est auctoritas Dionysii » (Denys semble avoir été considéré dès le XIII^e siècle comme un auteur quasi canonique). Cf. Th.-D. HUMBRECHT, *Théologie négative et noms divins chez saint Thomas d'Aquin* (cf. *supra*, n. 7), p. 748, qui renvoie d'ailleurs pour cette question à Ysabel de Andia et Christian Trottmann.

⁴⁰ Il y a d'autres références à Richard dans le *Super Sententiis*, notamment, mais nous nous en tiendrons à la *Somme théologique*, ce qui suffit pour l'objet de nos remarques.

Omnes operationes animae reducuntur ad simplicem contemplationem intelligibilis veritatis [...] cessante discursu, figatur eius intuitus in contemplatione unius simplicis veritatis [...]»⁴¹. » Toutes les opérations de l'âme se ramènent à la simple considération de la vérité intelligible [...] les raisonnements cessent, le regard [de l'esprit] se fixe dans la contemplation d'une vérité simple. Ce texte rappelle le traité ricardien. Le Victorin lui aussi suggère de dépouiller l'activité mentale des images et des raisonnements discursifs pour la rendre disponible à l'intuition du divin. C'est l'état de « l'homme qui a quitté toutes les pensées inférieures et les images, et qui peut enfin fixer son cœur dans le seul regard porté sur le spectacle des réalités supramondaines » (*in solo supermundanorum spectaculorum intuitu defigere*, III, 1, p. 270, l. 61 [110A]). Il nomme ce dernier niveau de regard *oculus intelligentiae* ou *intellectualis sensus* (III, 9, p. 298, l. 4 et 9 [119A]), sens voilé à la suite de la faute originelle, écarté des arcanes des secrets divins (p. 298, l. 11-14[119A]: « uelum magnum [...] quod contemplantis intuitum a diuinorum secretorum arcanis arceat »), mais que l'*illuminatio* divine vient rétablir pleinement. On notera que le mot *intuitus* peut être rendu par « intuition » et qu'il s'accorde ici parfaitement avec l'expérience contemplative⁴².

⁴¹ *Summa Th.* II^a-II^{ae}, q. 180, 6, ad 2. Un spécialiste de la pensée thomasienne, Olivier-Thomas Venard, dans *Pagina Sacra, Le passage de l'Écriture sainte à l'Écriture théologique*, Paris, 2009, p. 843, citant ce passage, commente ainsi: « La contemplation est réellement atteinte lorsque le processus à travers premiers principes et données multiples s'arrête dans le simple regard de l'âme. »

⁴² Il n'est pas besoin de l'opposer à *contuitus*, comme le voudrait Thierry-Dominique Humbrecht, qui fait de ce mot le terme approprié pour le « regard contemplatif », réservant l'*intuitus* au « regard méditatif », *op. cit.*, p. 249: « L'*intuitus* désigne chez Richard la méditation (qui reste un acte humain pénétré de raison), et c'est le *contuitus* qui désigne la contemplation. » Or la seule occurrence de *contuitus* dans le *De contemplatione* (et même sans doute dans toute l'œuvre de Richard) a lieu par le biais d'une citation de Hugues de Saint-Victor. C'est usuellement *intuitus* qu'utilise Richard, que ce soit pour la contemplation en général, la contemplation des intelligibles et celle des « intellectibles », c'est-à-dire les vérités au-delà de la raison, voir inaccessibles à celle-ci. Au demeurant, la littérature médiévale et les textes des Pères montrent qu'il serait difficile de séparer clairement les emplois de l'un et l'autre terme, même si dans *intuitus*, on peut ressentir parfois une nuance d'intention, de visée, et dans *contuitus*, un écho de *comprehendere*, saisir en comprenant. On se permettra de citer en outre la définition que donne Henri Bergson et qui s'accorde parfaitement à notre propos (*Introduction à la métaphysique*, dans *La Pensée et le mouvant*, Œuvres, Paris, 1959, p. 1395): « [...] un absolu ne saurait être donné que dans une *intuition*, tandis que tout le reste relève de l'analyse. Nous appelons ici intuition la *sympathie* par laquelle on se transporte à l'intérieur d'un objet pour coïncider avec ce qu'il a d'unique et par conséquent d'inexprimable. Au contraire, l'analyse est l'opération qui ramène l'objet à des éléments déjà connus, c'est-à-dire communs à cet objet et à d'autres. »

Dans la même question 180 (a. 6), l'Aquinat dit qu'il y a ressemblance entre l'homme et l'ange par l'intelligence, celle de ce dernier se distinguant par davantage d'ampleur (« vis intellectiva multo altior »). Au terme d'une complète ascèse de l'activité mentale, l'homme peut atteindre ce moment où il se fixe complètement dans la contemplation de Dieu à la manière des anges (« ponitur uniformitas conformis Angelis, secundum quod, praetermissis omnibus, in sola Dei contemplatione persistit »). Par une sorte d'« angélisation » de l'esprit, le vol de l'intelligence acquiert quelque ressemblance avec celui des anges, d'où le recours à l'image des chérubins qui représentent ce passage au-delà de l'humain⁴³.

À la fin de l'art. 3 (ad 3) de la q. 180, on peut faire encore un rapprochement avec les thèses ricardiennes. Saint Thomas dit : « [...] admiratio est species timoris consequens apprehensionem alicuius rei excedentis nostram facultatem. Unde admiratio est actus consequens contemplationem sublimis veritatis. Dictum est enim quod contemplatio in affectu terminatur. » Ce qui, pour l'Aquinat est une admiration empreinte d'une sorte d'effroi devant l'immensité du mystère apparu, était déjà l'admiration suscitée par l'extase selon Richard pour qui l'esprit (ou l'âme) appréhende quelque chose de tellement extraordinaire qu'il le plonge dans la stupéfaction admirative et qu'il suscite en lui la *iocunditas*, deux signes attestant l'expérience d'une réalité qui dépasse l'homme. Il s'agit toujours, pour l'un et l'autre, d'une *apprehensio*, d'une saisie de quelque chose qui est ressenti et vécu comme réel, une présence divine⁴⁴. Mais Richard affirme – ce qui est remarquable – que, comme les sens corporels voient les réalités corporelles en tant que quelque chose de présent physiquement, de même ce sens intellectif (*sensus intellectualis*, ou *oculus intelligentiae*) saisit lui aussi vraiment les invisibles dans leur invisibilité sans doute, mais dans la réalité de leur présence et de leur essence⁴⁵.

Nous nous arrêterons encore à un passage bien connu où saint Thomas porte un jugement sur une comparaison développée par Richard : les mouvements de la pensée illustrés par le vol des oiseaux (*De contempla-*

⁴³ Cf. IV, 1, p. 376-378, l. l. 31-33 [135D]. Voir encore IV, 6, p. 390, l. 23 [140A] : « ...humanum animum angelicam formam induere », et *passim*. Cf. aussi n. 34, *supra*.

⁴⁴ Cf. les propos de Henri Bremond cités par Michel de Certeau, dans *Le lieu de l'autre*, Paris, 2005, p. 66-67, qui nous ont suggéré cette référence à saint Thomas. Ne pourrait-on pas d'ailleurs comprendre le verset du Psaume 13, 5, « initium sapientiae timor Domini », comme aussi une manière de dire que l'accès à la Sagesse par l'extase s'accompagne initialement d'effroi devant le sentiment de la présence divine, d'une « sorte de crainte consécutive à l'appréhension de quelque chose qui excède notre faculté », pour reprendre les mots de Thomas ?

⁴⁵ III, 9, p. 298, l. 8-10 : « [...] sic utique intellectualis sensus inuisibilia capit, inuisibiliter quidem sed presentialiter, sed essentialiter. »

tione, I, 5, p. 98-100 [68C-69C]). Partant de l'idée que la contemplation est une manière de vol, selon l'image traditionnelle de l'envol de la pensée qui cherche à s'élever et à parcourir un vaste champ de connaissances, Richard propose de l'illustrer par une métaphore, celle du vol des oiseaux. La description réaliste de ces créatures pourvues d'ailes et aptes à se déplacer librement, à s'élever au-dessus des obstacles, à aller et venir selon des mouvements d'une extrême diversité et à des vitesses variables, tout cela sans effort visible, est évidemment très suggestive et se prête admirablement pour illustrer les modes d'activité de la pensée au sens large aussi bien qu'au sens spécifique et supérieur de contemplation orientée vers les mystères divins. Les mouvements ascendants, descendants, latéraux, circulaires, évoquent une pensée qui découvre, qui explore, qui se reprend, qui cherche, qui vérifie et compare. Et lorsque les oiseaux semblent tourner autour d'un même point naît l'idée qu'ils ont trouvé un sujet d'intérêt, quelque chose qui mérite une observation attentive. Tout cela s'adapte fort bien aux opérations de la pensée discursive et permet des rapprochements avec ce qu'on sera tenté d'appeler selon les cas une libre rêverie ou l'investigation mentale et le raisonnement sous ses diverses formes. Pour juger de la pertinence de cette comparaison, il est parfois fait référence à saint Thomas d'Aquin qui en traite dans la *Summa Th.* II^a-II^{ae}, q. 180, à l'article 6, et dont l'autorité peut justifier certains avis définitifs portés sur la métaphore ricardienne comparée aux descriptions qu'on peut lire dans les *Noms divins* du Pseudo-Aréopagite. L'Aquinate ne termine-t-il pas son exposé par cette appréciation : « D'où il apparaît que Denys décrit les mouvements de la contemplation de manière bien plus suffisante et subtile » (« unde patet quod Dionysius multo sufficientius et subtilius motus contemplationis describit ») ? En d'autres mots, l'analyse de Denys correspond mieux à la réalité et respecte mieux les nuances⁴⁶.

Mais il faut faire à cela quelques remarques qui nous permettront du même coup de mieux comprendre Richard. La formulation du Pseudo-Aréopagite, qui met en parallèle les mouvements supposés de la contemplation angélique avec ceux de l'âme humaine, ne peut pas être superposée à celle du Victorin, à moins de vouloir faire dire à celui-ci autre chose que ce qu'il a dit. Ce n'est pas rendre justice, croyons-nous, à la description de Richard, qui se place à un autre point de vue : lui ne parle pas de la

⁴⁶ Cf. aussi le jugement de Thierry-Dominique Humbrecht, dans son ouvrage *Théologie négative et noms divins chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, p. 752, et la note 1 à cette page. Cette métaphore a souvent été exploitée dans les écrits mystiques, mais généralement étroitement inspirée par la version qu'en donne Denys (voir ci-après) : Louis Chardon, par exemple, dans *La Croix de Jésus*, Paris, 2004, §§ 896-897, p. 795-796, reprend exactement les mouvements décrits par ce dernier (droit, en volute, circulaire).

vision angélique et distribue les divers mouvements selon d'autres critères⁴⁷. Les premiers mots du cinquième chapitre (*De contemplatione*, I, 5 [68C]), qui reprennent les dernières lignes du chapitre précédent, se réfèrent de manière évidente à la contemplation au sens strict de la définition donnée plus haut (*radius perspicax* reprend *libera perspicacia* et *perspicax contuitus* de I, 4, p. 96, l. 5 et 8 [67D]), laquelle est accompagnée ensuite des signes spécifiques de l'admiration (*admirationi inherere*, p. 96, l. 33 [68B]). Ces premiers mots sont suivis d'un rappel que la pensée n'agit pas toujours d'une manière uniforme (« id non semper uniformiter agitur »), en se référant à ce qui était dit plus haut : *cogitatio*, *meditatio* et *contemplatio* différent dans leurs modes, même s'il s'agit d'un même objet (I, 3, p. 92, l. 8-10 [66C-D] : « Unam eandemque materiam aliter per cogitationem intuemur, aliter per meditationem rimamur, atque aliter per contemplationem miramur ») ; il est donc possible de rêver librement sur un objet, de s'efforcer de le pénétrer par la méditation et même de s'immobiliser dans l'admiration de cet objet. Et même, ajoutait Richard, il peut y avoir passage d'un mode à l'autre sans discontinuité (I, 4, p. 96, l. 30 et p. 98, l. 33-34 [68B]) : « cogitatio in meditationem transit [...] et meditationem in contemplationem ergo transire ». Ce cinquième chapitre s'ouvre donc par la mise en place de trois modes qui vont ensuite se manifester à travers une diversité de mouvements. Cette diversité, dans ses premières formes que Richard relie à des activités plutôt de l'ordre du raisonnement, trouve évidemment un parallèle avec la métaphore des diverses figures que dessinent les oiseaux dans leurs vols. En fait il n'est pas difficile de déceler dans ces divers modes ce qui pourrait relever plutôt de la *cogitatio* (par exemple aller et venir, se hâter ou aller lentement, aller d'un objet à l'autre et revenir), de la *meditatio* (insister en tournant et retournant autour d'une même idée), et ce qui relèverait plus spécifiquement de la *contemplatio* (s'immobiliser, rester en admiration), et même de l'extase. En effet Richard compare ce dernier moment à l'épisode de la Transfiguration : « Il

⁴⁷ Voir *De div. nom.*, 4, § 8-9, PG 3, 704-705. Dans la version de Jean Scot : PL 122, 1133B-D (cf. la trad. de Maurice de Gandillac, dans *Œuvres complètes du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*, Paris, 1943, p. 102-103). Les trois mouvements que décrit Denys sont d'abord des « mouvements » des intelligences célestes (mouvement circulaire par union avec l'illumination du Beau et du Bien ; longitudinal lorsque ces intelligences condescendent vers les inférieures ; hélicoïdal lorsqu'elles joignent les deux mouvements précédemment décrits). Et par analogie ce sont les mouvements de l'âme : mouvement circulaire lorsqu'elle se recueille en elle-même, s'unifie et rejoint le Beau et le Bien ; hélicoïdal lorsqu'elle est illuminée par les connaissances divines, non intuitivement mais par des actes des raisons discursives ; longitudinal lorsqu'elle se tourne vers les symboles du monde extérieur pour y prendre appui dans sa quête du Beau et du Bien. Voir aussi, sur ces mouvements chez Denys, Y. de ANDIA, *Henosis, l'union à Dieu chez Denys l'Aréopagite*, Leiden – New York – Cologne, 1996, p. 137-138.

est possible de voir comment d'autres, en battant continûment des ailes, se tiennent longtemps suspendus au même endroit et, grâce à ce mouvement et à cette agitation, s'immobilisent presque, et ne s'écartent plus du tout du lieu où ils sont en suspens et comme attachés longuement et solidement; c'est comme si, en exécutant et en soutenant cette performance, ils s'exclamaient: 'Il est bon pour nous d'être ici'⁴⁸ ». La conclusion du développement reprend exactement les trois modes et surtout décrit le troisième (le mode de la contemplation extatique) avec l'évocation des états qui peuvent l'accompagner: s'attarder dans la joie, s'attacher avec insistance à cet objet, et s'y maintenir immobile (*suspensus*) aussi longtemps que possible⁴⁹. La fin du chapitre, qui reprend cinq modes, si on le lit tel quel, semble bien sûr contredire notre analyse. Les cinq références bibliques qui viennent clore le chapitre, et qui sont introduites, selon un procédé familier à Richard, pour en quelque sorte consolider par des textes sacrés les images qu'il propose, ces cinq références donc viennent encore renforcer l'impression que le lecteur pressé retire. Et pourtant nous voyons que le premier groupe de trois décrit plus proprement la cogitation (mais non exclusivement), qu'il est suivi par le mouvement circulaire qui s'applique davantage à la méditation, et par l'immobilité (la suspension) qui est plus spécifique de la contemplation, ce qui ramènerait finalement l'ensemble aux trois formes de base⁵⁰.

Saint Thomas, qui résume la thèse dionysienne, la définit par trois mouvements aux caractères géométriques bien marqués (ligne droite, cercle, spirale⁵¹). Richard se place dans une autre perspective, davantage soucieux

⁴⁸ I, 5 (p. 98-100, l. 21-26 [69A]): « Videre licet alia quomodo tremulis alis sepeque reuerberatis se in uno eodemque loco diutius suspendunt, et mobili se agitatione quasi immobiliter figunt, et ab eodem suspensionis sue loco diu multumque herentia penitus non recedunt, ac si operis et instantie sue executione prorsus uideantur exclamare et dicere *Bonum est nos hic esse*. » (Cf. *Matth.* 17, 4; *Marc.* 9, 4; *Luc.* 9, 33.)

⁴⁹ I, 5 (p. 100-102, l. 55-60 [69D]): « Vides certe, quod et superius locuti sumus, quomodo contemplationis nostre negotium semper iuxta aliquid suspenditur atque protrahitur, dum contemplantis animus iocunditatis sue spectaculo libenter inmoratur, dum semper studet uel in id ipsum sepe redire, uel in eodem diutius immobiliter permanere. »

⁵⁰ Un autre passage, lui sans doute connu de Richard, se lit dans la *Hiérarchie céleste* de Denys, en XV, 1 (PG 3, 328 B-C). Voir dans *La Hiérarchie céleste*, intr. par R. ROQUES, étude et texte critique par G. HEIL, trad. et notes par M. de GANDILLAC (*Sources Chrétiennes* 58bis), Paris, 1970, p. 165: « La conversion qui les [les vertus, ici les esprits angéliques] tend vers le haut, et le mouvement incessant qu'elles accomplissent autour d'elles-mêmes [...] et leur participation à la Vertu [la Puissance divine] providentielle... » Si l'on part de l'hypothèse que Richard ne connaissait bien que ce traité à travers Hugues, on est enclin à dire que la métaphore dionysienne n'a certainement pas inspiré Richard. Voir à ce propos nos remarques *supra*, p. 243, et la note 23, sur les rapports avec l'œuvre dionysienne.

⁵¹ Selon l'Aquinat, le mouvement en spirale combine le mouvement rectiligne et le mouvement circulaire, donc la recherche par l'âme tendue vers l'illumination et le mouvement descendant de l'illumination divine, si nous comprenons bien. Voir *De div. nom.*, 4, § 8-9,

de montrer la variété de l'activité de la pensée, allant des formes simples à des aspects plus nuancés, comme le caractère particulier que peut prendre tel mouvement trahissant la curiosité, l'hésitation, le va-et-vient de la pensée, l'étonnement, l'intérêt subit, etc. C'est une approche plus attentive à la psychologie de l'homme. Certes il ne se préoccupe pas toujours de bien distinguer les concepts qu'il met en place : s'il parle de contemplation tantôt au sens large tantôt au sens restreint⁵², s'il évoque des pratiques plutôt rationnelles à côté de moments d'admiration, il suppose que son auditeur saura faire les distinctions ; il établit des catégories, mais il part de l'hypothèse qu'on a à l'esprit ce qu'il a dit auparavant, que ces catégories sont perméables... Si l'on songe à la fluidité des mouvements de la pensée, on peut aisément procéder à une lecture plus nuancée et renoncer un peu au besoin de tout ranger dans des cases bien cloisonnées. Richard nous apparaît ainsi sous un meilleur jour : les multiples facettes de la réalité humaine le retiennent davantage que les nécessités d'une classification rigoureuse.

Une dernière remarque : il eût été intéressant d'en savoir plus sur les sentiments de Thomas, à la fin de sa vie, sur ce qu'il aurait dit de la contemplation lorsque, au témoignage de ses premiers biographes (par exemple Guillaume de Tocco qui parle d'extase), il aurait déclaré que tout ce qu'il avait écrit lui paraissait un brin de paille. Aveu d'avoir vécu et expérimenté finalement un autre savoir que celui qui s'acquiert au prix d'innombrables investigations rationnelles ?

d. *Hugues de Balma*

Hugues de Balma est quelque peu postérieur à saint Bonaventure. On ne sait que peu de choses sur sa vie. Il fut notamment prieur de la chartreuse de Meyriat de 1289 à 1304. Le traité qu'on lui attribue désormais avec grande certitude, intitulé *Theologia Mystica*, mais connu aussi sous le nom de *De triplici via*, ou encore *Viae Sion lugent*, aurait été composé avant 1297, nous dit l'auteur de l'Introduction à l'édition moderne⁵³. Sans entrer dans un examen comparatif détaillé, on dira que Hugues de Balma, sui-

PG 3, 704-705. Dans la version de Jean Scot : PL 122, 1133B-D ; cf. la trad. de Maurice de Gandillac, dans *Œuvres complètes du Pseudo-Denys l'Aréopagite*, Paris, 1943, pp. 102-103 ; en outre sur ce mouvement hélicoïdal ou en spirale, nous avons consulté *La Hiérarchie céleste* (cf. note ci-dessus), en particulier la note 2, p. 165, due à Maurice de Gandillac.

⁵² Le sixième chapitre, tout de suite après, parle de six genres, et l'on voit que pour Richard cette notion de contemplation prend des formes variées, où les facultés cohabitent et se mêlent dans l'acte de contempler, où le passage de la simple cogitation à la méditation et de celle-ci à la contemplation se dessine en filigrane.

⁵³ F. RUELO, *Hugues de Balma, Théologie mystique*, t. I, p. 12. Cf. *Théologie mystique*, I et II, introduction, texte latin, traduction, notes et index de F. RUELO, introd. et apparat crit. de J. BARBET (*Sources chrétiennes* 408-409), Paris 1995-1996.

vant la voie tracée par Thomas Gallus, développe une thèse selon laquelle il est possible d'atteindre à une contemplation extatique sans passer par les voies de la connaissance. C'est une thèse qui va fortement marquer la mystique des milieux cartusiens, et qui continuera à être défendue, notamment dans le cadre de ce qu'on appellera la mystique nuptiale, non sans nuances d'ailleurs. Elle soulèvera aussi des oppositions. Ce qui nous intéresse ici plus particulièrement c'est qu'elle se veut en rupture avec la conception ricardienne, du moins telle qu'elle est comprise et présentée par Hugues de Balma. Celui-ci cite expressément par deux fois l'*Archa mystica*, dont il nomme l'auteur. « Il y a, dit-il une première fois, une triple connaissance, l'une utilisant le miroir des créatures sensibles, ce qu'enseigne Richard de Saint-Victor⁵⁴ ». Nous n'y reconnaissons guère le *De contemplatione*. Immédiatement après d'ailleurs la référence aux « quarante-deux considérations » sur le passage du peuple d'Israël d'Égypte à la Terre promise nous oriente vers le *Libellus de formatione arche* de Hugues de Saint-Victor⁵⁵. Il y a manifestement confusion sur les titres (cf. ci-dessus, les divers intitulés du *De contemplatione*), le *Libellus* ayant parfois été désigné sous le nom de *De archa mystica*⁵⁶. D'où aussi confusion sur les auteurs, laquelle va donner naissance à des jugements mal fondés sur les positions ricardiennes. La confusion n'est pas moindre lorsque notre auteur mentionne encore les six degrés d'élévation permettant de parvenir jusqu'au Créateur⁵⁷. S'il y a bien six degrés ou genres dans le *De contemplatione* de Richard, ceux-ci n'ont rien à voir avec les six degrés mentionnés dans le *Libellus*, au même endroit, qui se réfèrent plutôt à l'histoire du salut : il s'agit du passage de la loi naturelle, qui est le premier degré, à la loi écrite, qui correspond aux deuxième et troisième degrés (oblation et purification), et à la grâce, qui correspond aux quatrième, cinquième et sixième degrés (confession, prière, pénitence)⁵⁸. La même référence à Richard et aux quarante-deux considérations, ainsi qu'aux six degrés, est reprise dans la *Quaestio difficilis*, au § 25, où Hugues de Balma oppose une démarche ascendante, celle de Richard, allant des réalités inférieures aux réalités supérieures, à celle qui va des réa-

⁵⁴ *Théologie mystique, La voie illuminative*, § 84 (t. II, p. 134) : « Unde cum sit triplex cognitio, una videlicet quae per speculum creaturarum sensibilium respicit, quae docetur a Ricardo de Sancto Victore in *Archa mystica*, ubi per XLIIas considerationes... »

⁵⁵ PL 176, 699D ; dans l'édition de P. SICARD, *De archa Noe, Libellus de formatione arche*, CC CM 176, [p. 155] l. 50-54 : « ... in latere arche intrinsecus in ordine scribuntur quadraginta due mansiones... »

⁵⁶ Cf. P. SICARD, *op. cit.*, p. 255*. Voir *supra*, p. 236.

⁵⁷ *Théologie mystique, ibidem* : « ... docet pervenire et per VI gradus ascendere ad omnium Creatorem. »

⁵⁸ *Libellus*, CC CM 176, [p. 155] l. 37-43 : « lex naturalis... sacrificium ; legi scripte ... oblatio et purificatio ; tria spiritalia, confessionem, orationem, carnis afflictionem. »

lités supérieures aux réalités inférieures, sous l'effet d'une lumière envoyée d'en haut.

Une fois encore, on constate qu'une connaissance imparfaite de l'ouvrage de Richard induit des appréciations erronées.

e. *Guigues Du Pont*

Nous mentionnerons encore Guigues Du Pont, chartreux lui aussi, mort en 1297⁵⁹. Il est l'auteur d'un traité sur la contemplation (*De contemplatione*⁶⁰). « Tout en reconnaissant la valeur de son prédécesseur Hugues de Balma, nous dit Dom Philippe Dupont⁶¹, il n'en recommande pas tout de suite la lecture [...] surtout parce qu'il lui reproche une importante lacune, celle de vouloir faire abstraction de l'activité intellectuelle au terme du processus de la contemplation. » Nous percevons là les échos d'un débat qui va se poursuivre encore longtemps entre ceux qui voient dans la contemplation une expérience affective surtout, et ceux qui maintiennent l'aspect noétique de cette expérience.

La lecture du traité de Guigues est assez ardue par la complexité de sa composition : trois parties, où plusieurs éléments sont repris à l'identique ou avec des nuances ; un vocabulaire qui puise chez nombre d'auteurs, sans que toujours le sens des mots soit homogène ; un mélange d'influences scolastiques (il suit saint Bonaventure et saint Thomas d'Aquin), grecques (sous l'impulsion de Hugues de Balma, il reprend les conceptions de Denys), patristiques (il est imprégné des textes des Pères, notamment saint Grégoire le Grand et saint Augustin) et médiévales (surtout les auteurs monastiques comme saint Bernard, Guillaume de Saint-Thierry, les chartreux Guigues I et II, Hugues de Balma déjà mentionné). Les sources de Guigues sont donc nombreuses, à côté de la Bible et des textes liturgiques. On sent qu'il a beaucoup lu les auteurs qui ont abordé la question de la connaissance spirituelle et plus particulièrement la contemplation. La liste des références relevées par Dom Philippe Dupont est éloquente.

Richard de Saint-Victor est donc lui aussi cité, et nous le trouvons mentionné en plusieurs passages. Par exemple au chapitre 7 du second livre, où Guigues reprend la distinction entre ce qui est *in ratione, supra rationem* et

⁵⁹ Sur cet auteur, voir *Guigues du Pont, Traité sur la contemplation*, introd., texte critique, trad. française et notes par Dom Ph. DUPONT, 2 parties, Salzbourg, 1985, *Analecta cartusiana*, éd. J. HOGG, 72. On peut également consulter l'article de C. TROTTMANN, « Contemplation et vie contemplative selon trois Chartreux : Guigues II, Hugues de Balma et Guigues Du Pont », paru dans la *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, 87, p. 633-680.

⁶⁰ Dans cette partie, pour distinguer le traité de Guigues de celui de Richard (intitulés les deux *De contemplatione*), nous citerons toujours le *De contemplatione* de Richard par le titre *Beni. mai.*, et celui de Guigues par *Tract. de contempl.*

⁶¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 7.

« non solum supra rationem, sed etiam praeter rationem⁶² ». De même au livre III, ch. 21, Guigues cite un long passage qu'on lit dans la III^e partie du traité ricardien, au chapitre 23, sur l'amour ordonné et l'amour mesuré (*Beni. maior*, p. 340 [132B-C]). Mais en y regardant de plus près, on a l'impression que Richard est cité surtout en tant que référence ponctuelle, parce qu'il propose une définition ou une distinction que Guigues peut reprendre pour sa propre analyse. Il n'est pas l'autorité qui s'impose pour sa conception de la vie contemplative. Et les références à son œuvre se situent au plan de l'emploi de termes ou de formulations, pas nécessairement à celui du sens qu'ils ont dans le traité victorin. Pour en revenir au chapitre 7 (l. II)⁶³, on voit que Guigues entreprend de décrire les trois degrés de ce qu'il appelle la contemplation « spéculative » (sur ce terme, voir ci-après). Le premier, *primus [gradus] scilicet consideratio*, est défini par un emprunt à saint Bernard⁶⁴. Pour le second, *scilicet alliciens meditatio* (la méditation qui attire), c'est la définition de Richard qui est donnée⁶⁵ : la méditation est un regard de l'esprit tourné vers un but⁶⁶, vivement absorbé dans la recherche de la vérité. On remarque d'abord que Guigues n'a retenu des deux définitions ricardiennes de la *meditatio* que la seconde, la première rappelant trop celle qu'on vient de lire de la *consideratio*⁶⁷. En outre le contexte est très

⁶² *Tract. de contempl.*, II, 7, l. 19-21, p. 206.

⁶³ *Idem*, pp. 204-209.

⁶⁴ *De consideratione*, II, 11, 5 (PL 182, 745B) : « intenta cogitatio animi investigantis verum », selon la citation de Guigues. Selon la Patrologie la définition se présente en fait ainsi : « Consideratio autem, intensa ad investigandum cogitatio, vel intentio animi vestigantis verum. » Dans ce texte, saint Bernard oppose la *contemplatio* à la *consideratio*. Il s'avère en tout cas que cette définition de la considération pourrait s'appliquer aussi à la méditation. De la *contemplatio* il dit au même endroit que c'est un regard (*intuitus*) de l'esprit (ou de l'âme, *animi*), vrai et certain (*verus et certus*), sur un objet (*de quacumque re*), ou une saisie du vrai (*apprehensio veri*), qui ne doute pas (qui n'hésite pas, *non dubia*).

⁶⁵ Cf. *Beni. mai.*, I, 4, p. 96, l. 10-11 [67D].

⁶⁶ Notre expression « tourné vers un but » traduit *prouidus*, adjectif qui veut dire littéralement « [regard] orienté vers l'avant », d'où les traductions habituelles par « prévoyant » ; mais ici le regard ne voit rien à l'avance, il se plonge en avant pour découvrir, d'où notre périphrase, qui s'oppose à l'inverse caractérisant la *cogitatio* (*improvidus*) telle que la définit Richard (« une manière qu'a l'esprit, enclin à vagabonder, de regarder sans but précis »).

⁶⁷ Les deux définitions de la méditation selon Richard de Saint-Victor (*Beni. mai.*, I, 4, p. 96, l. 9-11 [67D]) : « Meditatio uero est studiosa mentis intentio circa aliquid inuestigandum diligenter insistens. Vel sic : Meditatio est prouidus animi obtutus in ueritatis inquisitione uehementer occupatus. » La première définition, où domine la notion de *studiosa intentio*, marque bien ce que Richard de Saint-Victor veut voir dans cette activité : c'est le processus mental dans sa forme orientée vers un objet avec intensité et effort. Il est repris dans *uehementer* de la deuxième définition. Mais la définition de la *consideratio* selon Bernard (telle que rapportée par Guigues) parle aussi d'une pensée (ici *cogitatio* a le sens de l'activité de la pensée en général) *intenta* (qui s'applique avec attention à la recherche du vrai).

différent dans le traité de Richard. La méditation selon Guigues ne s'oppose pas à la pensée (*cogitatio*) qui saute d'un objet à l'autre, sans s'arrêter, au gré de sa fantaisie, comme le dit Richard, mais à une pensée qui est déjà attentive et orientée vers le vrai. Si les mots de Richard sont repris, ce n'est pas exactement selon sa pensée. Quant au troisième degré, on constate une même sorte de distorsion dans l'utilisation du texte ricardien. Guigues dit de ce degré qu'il est « la contemplation qui trouve », qu'il se situe « dans le regard et l'admiration de la souveraine vérité⁶⁸ ». L'éditeur, à l'apparat de sources, p. 206 (n. 3), nous renvoie au *Beni. mai.* I, 4, sans doute à la première définition ricardienne : « une pénétration libre de l'esprit dans les manifestations de la Sagesse, et qui demeure suspendue en admiration⁶⁹ ». La suite rappelle aussi le *De contemplatione* de Richard, mais là également dans un rapport aux mots, selon une perspective très différente : « *Ista species partim est in ratione, partim supra rationem; altera non solum supra rationem, sed etiam praeter rationem videtur esse.* » Cette sorte de contemplation, c'est-à-dire la *contemplatio inveniens* qu'on vient de définir, est en partie dans la raison, en partie au-dessus. Les mots sont ricardiens, sauf *partim*. Celui-ci semble signifier que cette contemplation couvre l'ensemble des réalités intelligibles, soit découvertes par la raison, soit reçues par une révélation ou une grâce et que la raison peut saisir. On serait donc près des thèses de Richard qui distingue un quatrième genre de contemplation sans images, mais nourrie entièrement par les ressources de la raison, et un cinquième genre où l'esprit est soulevé par l'apport des vérités révélées, dont certaines ne répugnent pas à la raison, mais qui sont saisies par l'intelligence pure et simple, c'est-à-dire sans le recours aux images et sans

⁶⁸ *Tract. de contempl.*, II, 7, l. 17-19, p. 206 : « *Tertius gradus, scilicet contemplatio inveniens, est in conspectu et admiratione summae veritatis.* » Réminiscence peut-être de l'adage célèbre de Hugues de Saint-Victor (*Hom. in Ecclesiasten*, *hom.* I, PL 175, 117B) : « *Meditatio quaerit, contemplatio possidet.* »

⁶⁹ Définition déjà donnée *supra*, en note 12 : « *Contemplatio est libera mentis perspicacia in sapientiae spectacula, cum admiratione suspensa* », où l'on a l'admiration, mais chez Richard, de l'ensemble des œuvres de la Sagesse. Richard, aussitôt après, donnait aussi une autre définition qu'il empruntait à Hugues de Saint Victor : « *Contemplatio est perspicax et liber animi contuitus in res perspicendas usquequaque diffusus* », où *contuitus* est à la place de *conspectus*, mais où *res*, qui correspond à l'idée d'une contemplation au sens général pouvant se porter sur tout objet suscitant l'admiration, n'équivaut pas à *summa veritas* de la définition du chartreux. On remarque à ce propos que *contuitus* n'apparaît qu'une seule fois dans le traité de Guigues, selon le relevé de Dom Dupont (I, 8, l. 193, p. 146), où il désigne la vision directe (*rectus*) de la face de Dieu. En revanche, c'est le terme qu'emploie saint Bonaventure pour désigner le degré élevé de la contemplation, *per simplicem contuitum* (cf. *Saint Bonaventure, Le Christ Maître*, éd., trad. et commentaire du sermon universitaire "Vnus est magister noster Christus", par G. MADEC, Paris, 1998, p. 77).

la mise en œuvre de procédures propres au raisonnement⁷⁰. Richard donne comme exemple du cinquième genre les propriétés de l'essence divine et la suprême simplicité de Dieu, qui ont été révélées par les Écritures et que la raison reçoit sans s'y opposer. Guigues introduit d'autre part une distinction totalement étrangère à la pensée du Victorin quand il passe à la catégorie *praeter rationem*. L'*altera* [*species*] ne peut que renvoyer à un autre mode de contemplation cette fois, la contemplation « anagogique », comme il la nomme. Alors que la première, celle qu'il appelle « spéculative », procède par affirmation, la seconde (*alia*) agit par négation⁷¹. Nous sommes dès lors dans le mode de pensée de Denys (cataphatique et apophatique). Plus rien ne nous rattache aux thèses de Richard, sinon les mots *supra* et *praeter*. Chez ce dernier, ils signifient un dépassement de la raison pour accéder à un mode d'intelligence supérieur, fécondé par la grâce et la révélation des Écritures⁷².

⁷⁰ *Beni. mai.*, I, 6 (p. 106, l. 51-54 [71B-C]) : « Dans le quatrième genre, la contemplation se forme dans la raison et selon la raison (*in ratione et secundum rationem formatur*) : cela se produit surtout quand, une fois écartée toute intervention de l'imagination (*semoto omni imaginationis officio*), l'âme ne vise que des objets inconnus de l'imagination mais que l'esprit conçoit par le raisonnement et appréhende par la raison (*solis illis animus intendit que imaginatio non nouit, sed que mens ex ratiocinatione colligit uel per rationem comprehendit*). » Et *ibidem* p. 108, l. 78-84 [72A-B] : « Du cinquième genre de contemplation, nous avons dit qu'il était au-dessus de la raison (*supra rationem*), mais non pas cependant au-delà (*praeter*) [...] Telles sont les vérités de foi sur la nature divine et son essence simple, et auxquelles nous adhérons par l'autorité des saintes Écritures (*talia sunt illa que de diuinitatis natura, et illa simplici essentia credimus, et scripturarum diuinarum auctoritate probamus*). Mais il faut penser cette contemplation comme étant au-dessus de la raison et non en dehors de la raison, quand la raison de l'homme ne peut contredire ce qui est perçu par la fine pointe de l'intelligence, bien plus, qu'elle y acquiesce plutôt volontiers et lui donne son approbation (*supra rationem nec tamen preter rationem censenda est, quando ei quod per intelligentie aciem cernitur, humana ratio contraire non potest, quin potius facile adquiescit et sua attestazione alludit*). » On pourrait donc dire, avec les mots de Guigues, que l'un de ces genres est *in ratione*, l'autre *supra rationem*, mais ils ne constituent pour Guigues qu'une seule [*ista*] *species* divisée en deux parties. L'*altera species* correspondrait au sixième genre, mais en fait il s'agira d'autre chose.

⁷¹ Trad. P. Dupont. *Tract. de contempl.*, II, 7, l. 22-23, p. 206 : « Prima species speculationis, scilicet contemplativa, agitur per affirmationem, alia per abnegationem. »

⁷² Définition du sixième genre selon Richard, I, 6 (p. 108, l. 90-97 [72B]) : « Le sixième genre de contemplation [...] est celui qui s'occupe des réalités qui sont au-dessus de la raison et qui paraissent être au-delà, voire contre la raison (*que sunt supra rationem, et uidentur esse preter seu etiam contra rationem*). Dans ce niveau de vision contemplative le plus élevé et le plus digne de tous (*in hac utique suprema omniumque dignissima contemplationum specula*), l'âme exulte véritablement et bondit de joie (*animus ueraciter exultat atque tripudiat*), quand elle connaît alors ces réalités par une illumination divine (*ex diuini luminis irradiatione*) et les considère, réalités contre lesquelles la raison humaine regimbe (*quibus omnis humana ratio reclamat*). Telles sont presque toutes les vérités sur la Trinité des personnes que nous sommes invités à croire : quand on interroge sur elles la raison humaine, celle-ci semble ne pouvoir que s'y opposer (*de quibus cum humana ratio consulitur, nichil aliud quam contraire uidetur*). »

Guigues de son côté rejoint Hugues de Balma qui rejetait toute contemplation impliquant l'intellect, suivant (ou croyant suivre⁷³) en cela Denys. On voit que le chartreux essaie ici néanmoins de sauvegarder une place à la « connaissance », selon le principe affirmé par saint Augustin, par exemple, qu'on ne peut aimer sans connaître, et d'introduire en même temps une autre forme de contemplation, selon le courant illustré par saint Bernard⁷⁴, Denys, et privilégié par son prédécesseur en chartreuse, Hugues de Balma. Il y aurait lieu d'examiner d'autres cas où Guigues paraît se référer au Victorin, mais ce travail dépasserait le cadre du présent article. Dom Dupont donne à la fin de son ouvrage une liste importante de références à Richard, surtout au *Beniamin maior*, collectées dans le traité de Guigues⁷⁵.

Si nous nous sommes attardé sur cet exemple, c'est pour montrer d'abord le souci de Guigues de concilier les différentes thèses sur la contemplation qui ont cours de son temps (on n'oublie pas Richard, mais le courant diognysien domine); c'est le début d'un débat qui va se prolonger jusqu'à des époques récentes, avec une prédominance des auteurs privilégiant l'expérience mystique affective. Ce souci entraîne le chartreux dans un exposé complexe, difficile parfois, et marqué par l'importance de l'approche christologique – méditation sur le Christ Verbe incarné, rédempteur, sur son sacrifice –, et dans un ton d'écriture qui révèle une préoccupation surtout monastique, s'adressant de manière spécifique à un lectorat chartreux et à tout le moins vivant dans des monastères⁷⁶. L'exemple illustre pour nous surtout la manière dont on va de plus en plus citer le Victorin et utiliser ses traités.

3. Dante Alighieri et Richard de Saint-Victor

Les propos qui suivent tentent de clarifier la portée de l'éloge de Richard que fait Dante, et de proposer une lecture du *Paradis* dans la perspective

⁷³ Sur ce point précis, voir notamment les remarques d'Édouard-Henri Wéber, dans *Albert le Grand, Commentaire de la théologie mystique...* (cf. *supra*, n. 7), p. 49-50, et aussi pp. 21-22. Cf. aussi une analyse plus récente : T.-D. HUMBRECHT, « Albert le Grand commentateur de la théologie mystique de Denys », dans *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, t. 90 (2006/2), pp. 225-271.

⁷⁴ S. Bernard : *In cant.*, 49, 4 (*Sermons sur le Cantique* III, Sources Chrétiennes 452, Paris, 2000, p. 334) : « ... duo sint beatae contemplationis excessus, in intellectu unus et alter in affectu... »

⁷⁵ *Tract. de contempl.*, 2^e partie, pp. 443-444.

⁷⁶ On peut dire, croyons-nous, que l'état de chanoine régulier de Richard l'incitait à s'adresser aux chrétiens aussi bien laïcs que clercs.

du Victorin. La confrontation des deux textes permet d'ailleurs un éclairage utile sur leurs significations⁷⁷.

Les inspireurs de Dante sont nombreux. À des degrés divers et en fonction de sa propre évolution, voire de l'intention qui présidait à ses œuvres (politique, esthétique ou spirituelle), un vaste réseau de références affleure dans ses écrits. Il a lu et garde à l'esprit saint Thomas d'Aquin, mais sans doute encore plus peut-être Albert le Grand⁷⁸, et en outre saint Bernard⁷⁹, saint Augustin, saint Bonaventure, et d'autres encore⁸⁰. Mais il connaissait aussi les victorins et en particulier Richard de Saint-Victor⁸¹. On le sait :

⁷⁷ Depuis la première rédaction de ces notes et celle des éléments que nous avons déjà donnés dans notre édition du *De contemplatione*, est paru un ouvrage sur les rapports entre Richard de Saint-Victor et Dante : M. MOCAN, *L'arca della mente, Riccardo di San Vittore nella "Commedia" di Dante*, Florence, 2012. Nous venons d'en prendre connaissance. Cet ouvrage confirme largement nos intuitions sur l'influence ricardienne. Il le fait d'ailleurs de manière beaucoup plus large que notre point de vue qui se cantonnait surtout au thème de l'extase en ne prenant en compte en fait que le *Paradiso*, *L'Épître à Cangrande della Scala* et, pour le Victorin, le *De contemplatione*. La remarquable étude de Madame Mira Mocan couvre toute l'œuvre de Dante et plusieurs textes de Richard, développant d'autres thèmes que ceux auxquels nous nous sommes arrêté.

⁷⁸ Cf. Bruno Nardi selon André Pézard (*Dante, Œuvres complètes*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Paris, 1965, p. 1444).

⁷⁹ Dans *Paradis*, XXXII, 1-3, saint Bernard assume l'office de docteur, celui qui enseigne à Dante le sens de ce qu'il voit, et qui est aussi désigné comme un contemplatif. Il est encore mentionné expressément dans l'*Épître XIII*, § 28, p. 807 (voir l'édition des *Œuvres complètes*, par André Pézard ; l'*Épître XIII* est aux pages 790 à 809 ; cf. note ci-dessus). Cf. E. G. GARDNER, *Dante and the Mystics, a study of the mystical aspect of the Divina commedia and its relations with some of its mediaeval sources*, Londres, 1913 (*The McMaster Collection*. Paper 161, <<http://digitalcommons.mcmaster.ca/mcmastercollection/161>>).

⁸⁰ Étant donné l'importance du rôle de la lumière dans l'expérience mystique décrite par Dante, il faudrait mentionner aussi l'École d'Oxford, nommément Robert Grosseteste et son traité *De luce seu de inchoatione formarum* (traduction française par D. OTTAVIANI, dans *La philosophie de la lumière chez Dante. Du « Convivio » à la « Divine comédie »*, Paris, 2004). Mais ce traité fut-il connu de Dante ?

⁸¹ Étienne Gilson s'est exprimé naguère sur les sources de Dante dans un article intitulé « La Conclusion de la "Divine Comédie" et la mystique franciscaine », paru dans la *Revue d'histoire franciscaine*, I (1924), p. 55-63. Il a donné l'impression que la cause était entendue et que c'est saint Bonaventure avant tout qui avait inspiré Dante pour toute la partie du *Paradis* où le poète évoque une expérience contemplative. L'éminent médiéviste glisse bien, en passant, que « tout le chant XXXIII est étroitement dépendant de deux œuvres mystiques très célèbres au moyen âge et que Dante a certainement connues, le *Beniamin maior* de Richard de Saint-Victor et l'*Itinerarium mentis in Deum* de Saint Bonaventure », mais non sans relativiser quelque peu la place du Victorin ; Étienne Gilson était un lecteur trop fin et perspicace pour nier une certaine inspiration de Dante qui prendrait aussi sa source, modestement, chez Richard, mais il l'évacue en quelque sorte, après l'avoir concédée brièvement. Il conclut, d'après certains indices, que Dante écrivait le dernier chant du *Paradis* avec l'*Itinerarium* sous les yeux, en suivant pas à pas sa méthode. Cette prise de position a été contestée, mais en tout cas dans les milieux francophones, elle semble bien avoir été reçue comme définitive, c'est du moins l'impression que laissent les notes des traducteurs consultés.

Dante était nourri de la philosophie et de la théologie de son temps, et par conséquent des grands auteurs qui illustraient ces disciplines, auxquels s'ajoutaient les Néoplatoniciens et Aristote récemment traduits.

Nous aimerions reprendre ici la question des parallèles que l'on peut faire avec le *Beniamin maior* surtout, en partant de plus loin, et d'abord du témoignage de Dante lui-même et des textes qu'il produit pour éclairer la nature de son expérience contemplative et en valider la possibilité.

Dans l'*Épître* XIII, épître dédicatoire adressée à Cangrande della Scala⁸², il explique le sens et la nature de l'ensemble de l'œuvre et les divers niveaux de lecture. Son poème a pour sujet l'homme allant au-devant de la Justice qui récompense, en d'autres mots, l'homme qui s'avance vers la vie céleste réservée aux âmes bienheureuses⁸³. Il s'agit de la lecture allégorique qui comporte aussi un sens anagogique par lequel « il signifie la sortie de l'âme sainte hors de la servitude du monde corrompu, et la liberté de la gloire éternelle⁸⁴ ». Passant ensuite à l'explication du titre et à la description de la forme, il rappelle alors qu'il en est l'auteur, et mieux « l'agent pleinier⁸⁵ ». Il renvoie pour cela à l'exorde du *Paradis* où, on ne peut plus clairement, il déclare :

Nel ciel che più de la sua luce prende
fu'io, e vidi cose che ridire
né sa né può chi di là sù discende;
perché appressando sé al suo disire,
nostro intelletto si profonda tanto,
che dietro la memoria non può ire⁸⁶.

⁸² Les érudits se sont autrefois divisés entre les tenants et les adversaires de l'authenticité de cette lettre. Plusieurs articles récents que nous avons pu consulter ne semblent pas remettre en question l'authenticité, et notre sentiment est que son contenu va dans ce sens et exprime certainement la pensée de Dante (voir, par exemple, U. ECO, *De l'arbre au labyrinthe*, Paris, 2010, p. 198). Sur cette problématique, on peut lire encore avec profit une étude fouillée, déjà ancienne, mais qui nous semble très solidement argumentée : E. MOORE, « The Genuineness of the Dedicatory Epistle to Can Grande », dans *Studies in Dante, Third Series, Miscellaneous Essays*, Oxford, 1903, p. 284-369. Il faut néanmoins signaler une prise de position récente (C. GINZBURG, « L'Épître à Cangrande et ses deux auteurs » dans *Poésie* 125, janvier 2009, p. 127-142) : il y aurait deux auteurs, la seconde partie de la lettre nourrie d'éléments remontant à Dante, semble-t-il, n'étant peut-être pas de sa main ? Faute d'avoir accès à l'ouvrage complet annoncé sur Dante, nous ne pouvons nous prononcer. Mais il nous semble évident que les passages auxquels nous nous référons sont conformes à la pensée de Dante, telle qu'elle apparaît dans la *Comédie* et telle qu'elle se lit dans l'*Épître*, et reflètent fidèlement une filiation reconnue avec Richard. Nous citons les extraits de cette lettre d'après l'édition d'André Pézard (cf. *supra*, n. 78), non sans retoucher parfois la traduction. Le texte latin de l'*Épître* provient de la base de données <danteonline.it>.

⁸³ § [11], p. 797.

⁸⁴ § [7], p. 795.

⁸⁵ § [14], p. 798.

⁸⁶ *Paradis*, I, 4-9, tr. Alexandre Masseron modifiée (cf. *La Divine Comédie, Paradis*, t. établi, trad., présenté par A. MASSERON, Club Français du Livre, Paris, 1964, p. 6) : « Au

Ce que nous voulons souligner par ce rappel, c'est l'orientation que donne Dante à son projet : j'ai eu une expérience, dit-il, j'en rends compte ici, comme d'une expérience de l'ordre de la contemplation la plus élevée, celle qui dépasse les moyens de l'expression humaine, car la profondeur en laquelle est allée mon intelligence est hors de portée de la mémoire. La même affirmation selon laquelle « il a vu » reviendra à plusieurs reprises dans la lettre⁸⁷. Et sur cette expérience, il donne une précision importante : le divin rayon – ou la divine gloire – fut reçu dans l'Empyrée, lieu de spirituelle ardeur (amour saint ou charité)⁸⁸, ce « qui revient à dire ciel de flamme, ou encore très lumineux⁸⁹ ». La lumière qui éclaire, dans l'unité du divin, est aussi ardeur qui enflamme. Ce qu'il a vu, il ne peut le redire, « car l'intellect humain s'élève si haut, quand il s'élève, que la mémoire à son retour est défaillante, parce qu'il y a eu dépassement des moyens humains »⁹⁰.

Si donc ce qu'il va rapporter défie l'expression ordinaire, Dante cherche confirmation et appui en énumérant alors les autorités qui viennent garantir la possibilité d'une expérience telle que celle qu'il a connue, ou en tout cas, la description qu'il essaie d'en donner⁹¹. Il se réfère au récit de l'extase de saint Paul (*II Cor.* 12, 3-4) qu'il commente ainsi : « Voilà donc, après cette montée où l'intellect avait passé la mesure faite aux hommes, voilà qu'il n'avait plus souvenance des choses venues en dehors de lui⁹². » Il mentionne encore le récit de la Transfiguration dans l'évan-

ciel qui reçoit le plus de sa lumière, moi je suis allé, et j'ai vu des choses que ne sait ni ne peut redire qui descend de là-haut ; car en approchant de l'objet de son désir, notre intelligence pénètre si profondément que la mémoire ne peut la suivre. » Nos citations du texte italien sont tirées de cette édition, mais contrôlées pour l'orthographe d'après la base de données <danteonline.it>.

⁸⁷ *Épître XIII*, § 19, *in fine* (p. 800) ; § 24 (p. 803), où il dit qu'il fut lui-même en ce ciel qui reçoit la gloire de Dieu, c'est-à-dire la lumière, par plus grande abondance (« dicit quod fuit in celo illo quod de gloria Dei, sive de luce, recipit affluentius ») ; § 28 (p. 806). *L'Épître XIII* reprend exactement ce qu'on a lu dans le chant I du *Paradis*, au vers 5.

⁸⁸ § 24, *in fine* (p. 804).

⁸⁹ Cf. *Convivio*, II, III, 8 : « lo cielo Empireo, che è a dire cielo di fiamma o vero luminoso » (éd. Pézard, p. 320).

⁹⁰ § 28 : « ... [intellectus humanus] quando elevatur, in tantum elevatur, ut memoria post reditum deficiat propter transcendisse humanum modum ». C'est l'expérience de l'élévation et du dépassement des limites et des moyens de l'humaine intelligence. Richard de Saint-Victor, *De contemplatione*, I, 6 (p. 108, l. 84-87 [72A-B]) : « Contemplatio ergo nostra tunc veraciter supra rationem ascendit, quando id animus per mentis sublevationem cernit quod humanae capacitatis metas transcendit. » Cf. aussi V, 2 (p. 508 [170A]), et *passim*.

⁹¹ § 28 (p. 807).

⁹² « Ecce, postquam humanam rationem intellectus ascensione transierat, quid extra se ageretur non recordabatur. » Dans *Paradis*, I, 9, même aveu de l'impuissance de la mémoire (cf. *supra*, n. 86). Ce qui se produit et se passe hors de l'homme en extase (suite à l'*excessus mentis*) ne peut être retenu par la mémoire ; cf. *De contemplatione*, IV, 23 (p. 468, l. 38-

gile de saint Matthieu, et les prophéties d'Ézéchiel. Tous ces témoignages ont en commun d'être la relation d'une expérience où l'esprit a été plongé dans une connaissance dont il revient sans pouvoir en rapporter tout le contenu, faute de mots pour le dire, et faute de pouvoir conserver le tout en mémoire⁹³. Ensuite l'auteur invoque trois autorités parmi les auteurs ecclésiastiques : dans l'ordre, Richard de Saint-Victor, saint Bernard et saint Augustin. Et, dernier recours contre ceux qui pourraient s'indigner que le poète évoque un privilège aussi inouï qui lui aurait été accordé, il fait appel à l'exemple de Nabuchodonosor, roi indigne d'une telle grâce, mais dont le prophète Daniel atteste qu'il bénéficia, aussi surprenant que cela fût, de visions divines qu'il ne comprenait pas, car Dieu « sait aussi – soit plus, soit moins, selon qu'il lui plaît – manifester sa gloire aux mal vivants, tant male vie fassent-ils⁹⁴ ». L'épître dédicatoire se termine par l'affirmation renouvelée que le poète « a vu », qu'il ne sait plus telles choses qu'il a oubliées, et telles choses dont il a conservé le souvenir et qu'il a retenues, il ne peut les dire, faute de mots⁹⁵. Ce qu'il a trouvé dans cette expérience, c'est « le principe ou le premier être, à savoir Dieu », de sorte qu'il n'est

44 [167B-C]) : « Cum enim per mentis excessum supra sive intra nosmetipsos in divinorum contemplationem rapimur, exteriorum omnium statim imo non solum eorum quae extra nos, verum etiam eorum quae in nobis sunt omnium obliviscimur. Et item cum ab illo sublimitatis statu ad nosmetipsos redimus, illa quae prius supra nosmetipsos vidimus in ea veritate vel claritate qua prius perspeximus ad nostram memoriam revocare omnino non possumus. » Ou encore, en V, 18 (p. 570, l. 36-37 [191A]) : « ... et extra semetipsum raptus quid in se vel circa se agatur, penitus nescit. » Il y a non seulement oubli de ce qui est « vu », mais l'esprit en extase ne sait plus ce qui se passe autour de lui.

⁹³ Dans la Transfiguration, le Christ apparaît vêtu de gloire ou de lumière, ce qu'exprime le vêtement blanc (toujours associé aux visions d'êtres spirituels venant de l'au-delà) ; le sens en est que l'Homme-Christ sera au-delà du monde des humains (Résurrection). Mais il y a aussi un message divin, une « voix divine » : dans la Transfiguration, les apôtres voient et entendent : il faudra dire ce qui est au-delà des mots de l'homme par les moyens de l'homme, la voix et les images. Cf. *infra*, p. 272 : le Christ, voix du Père.

⁹⁴ *Op. cit.*, § 28 (p. 807) : « [Deus] plus et minus, ut vult, gloriam suam quantumcunque male viventibus manifestat. » Cf. Richard de Saint-Victor, qui a consacré un traité aux visions de Nabuchodonosor, et qui dit à ce propos que la grâce de la contemplation parfois nous est accordée par Dieu, parfois nous est retirée, parfois même est augmentée (*De erud. hom. int.*, I, 1, 1231A) : « Quid, inquam, in his omnibus nobis innuitur, nisi quod contemplationis gratia quandoque divinitus datur, interdum subtrahitur, tandemque multiplicius reparatur », et il arrive souvent que dans le même esprit, de façon miraculeuse et par miséricorde, l'intelligence humaine reçoive des lumières sur les choses divines... (*idem*, I, 40, 1295A : « et fit utique saepe in uno eodemque animo, modo mirabili atque miserando, ut unde in summis intelligentia humana ad divina illuminatur... »).

⁹⁵ § 29 : « Vidit ergo, ut dicit, aliqua 'que referre nescit et nequit rediens' [...] nescit quia oblitus, nequit quia, si recordatur et contentum tenet, sermo tamen deficit. »

plus rien à chercher au-delà⁹⁶, le traité s'achevant ainsi « dans le nom même de Dieu⁹⁷ ».

Il fut donc bien question, dans le Paradis, d'une expérience vécue. Dans le prologue qui ouvre le premier chant, Dante le redit (I, 1-6) : il est allé dans l'Empyrée (« fu'io », trad. Pézard : « j'y fus »), le lieu où la gloire divine, resplendit le plus⁹⁸. Et ne sait ni ne peut redire ce qu'il a vu (« e vidi »), celui qui descend de là-haut (« chi di lassù discende »). L'écho ici de la parole de saint Paul est si fort qu'on entend – presque, ou certainement ? – les mots pauliniens « sive in corpore sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit » (je ne sais si c'est en mon corps ou hors de mon corps, Dieu le sait), mots qui diraient que Dante lui aussi ne sait s'il est monté avec son corps ou hors de son corps, et « ne peut redire [celui] qui descend de là-haut » (trad. Masseron)⁹⁹. De ce qu'il a vu, il ne peut garder le souvenir, car l'intelligence plonge en de telles profondeurs que la mémoire ne peut y aller (7-8)¹⁰⁰. Et le poète alors se tourne vers Apollon, le dieu de la poésie, pour qu'il l'aide à dire ce qu'il a thésaurisé dans son intelligence, et qui sera la matière de

⁹⁶ § 33 : « Et quia, invento principio seu primo, videlicet Deo, nichil est quod ulterius queratur... » Richard a une expression analogue, en IV, 5 (p. 386, l. 24-26 [139A]) : « Profecto ultra Deum nichil est, et iccirco scientia altius, uel ulterius ascendere non potest. » C'est peut-être aussi le thème inscrit dans l'histoire d'Ulysse qui dépasse inconsidérément les limites des colonnes d'Hercule, comprises comme les limites de la raison humaine (cf. *Inferno*, XXVI, v. 107-109, puis 112-117) ; voir R. IMBACH, *Dante, la philosophie et les laïcs*, Fribourg (Suisse) – Paris, 1996, p. 229 *sqq.*, et qui, en page 237, s'appuie encore sur *Convivio*, III, xv, 9 ; thèse d'ailleurs que rejetait par avance André Pézard (*Dante, Œuvres complètes*, p. 1050-1051).

⁹⁷ § 33. « ... in ipso Deo terminatur tractatus... » Le *tractatus* désigne ce qu'il appelle plus haut la *pars executiva*, c'est-à-dire le corps même du poème sur le Paradis, après un prologue ; ce *tractatus* commence, selon l'*Épître*, au vers 37 (*Paradis I*).

⁹⁸ « Gloire », le premier mot de cette partie de la Comédie, s'impose : éblouissement et aveuglement ; c'est le royaume glorieux de Dieu, nous dit d'emblée Dante.

⁹⁹ Qu'a-t-il vu ? Étienne Gilson règle la question en quelques mots (*op. cit.*, p. 57) : « ... ni peut-être Richard de Saint-Victor, ni certainement saint Bonaventure n'admettent qu'il y ait vision de Dieu dans l'extase. » Pour Richard de Saint-Victor, notons que le « peut-être » n'est pas décisif, et il faut y aller voir de plus près, ce qu'Étienne Gilson probablement n'a pas fait (la restriction est à son honneur et témoigne de son honnêteté intellectuelle). Pour le surplus, il avance une définition de l'extase qui lui est propre ou qu'il tire de saint Bonaventure (cf. *supra*, n. 32), mais qui n'est certainement pas celle de Richard et, partant de là, il fait ce qu'il reproche parfois aux autres commentateurs (p. 58) : par son propre commentaire sur l'extase, il chasse du texte l'hypothèse d'une vision de Dieu. Nous sommes tenté d'ajouter qu'il est un peu présomptueux de dire avec une tranquille assurance ce que le contemplatif en extase « voit » ou « connaît » : Dieu en son essence ou non. Comment décider de ce qui est une expérience que nous n'avons pas faite, à la place de ceux qui l'ont eue. Nous pourrions dire, en paraphrasant saint Paul, que « Dieu seul le sait ». Ou en citant Dante (*Paradis*, 19, 79-81, trad. Masseron retouchée, p. 387) : « Or qui es-tu, toi qui veux siéger en chaire pour juger à distance d'un millier de milles, et dont la vue ne porte qu'à un empan ? »

¹⁰⁰ Cf. *supra*, le texte de Dante, p. 262, et la note 86.

son chant. Car la poésie reste le meilleur instrument pour dire l'indicible. Mais sans doute est-ce aussi un appel à Dieu pour qu'il lui donne le moyen de s'avancer dans ce pèlerinage¹⁰¹. L'entrée dans la voie contemplative ne peut se faire sans l'aide divine. Il faut d'abord être dépouillé complètement de toute attache charnelle, de toute la chair, comme Marsyas (désincarné). C'est la discipline proposée par Richard en IV, 6 (p. 390, l. 20-25 [140A]) : purifier l'or de l'intelligence en le frappant, en le fondant, pour éliminer les scories charnelles, afin de revêtir la forme angélique et d'atteindre à un état supramondain, « un état vraiment plus qu'humain » (*in supermundanum quendam, et uere plus quam humanum habitum transire*). Ainsi se prépare ce que Dante va dire avec le mot *trasumanar* : transhumanisation, transformation par dépassement de l'humain (*Paradis* I, v. 67-73)¹⁰² :

Nel suo aspetto tal dentro mi fei,
 qual si fé Glauco nel gustar de l'erba,
 che 'l fé consorto in mar de li altri dèi ;
 Trasumanar significar per verba
 non si poria ; però l'esempio basti
 a cui esperienza grazia serba.

C'est une perte des repères humains, une ivresse, celle de Glaucus comme celle dont parle aussi Richard (IV, 16, p. 432, l. 59 *sqq.* [155C-D]), ce moment où l'esprit goûte à une nourriture supérieure à celle que procure la simple méditation, où s'opère l'aliénation de l'esprit, c'est-à-dire l'extase : *ebrietas autem mentis alienationem efficit ... in mentis excessum abducit*)¹⁰³. En disant que Glaucus devint compagnon des autres dieux, Dante semble bien dire que cette ivresse correspond à un passage dans le monde divin, celui des intelligences dont parle Aristote, celui des anges et des bienheureux (*Paradis*, XXXI-XXXIII), là où il les a vus autour de Dieu. Et après avoir affirmé le caractère ineffable (indicible *per verba*), Dante achève par

¹⁰¹ Cf. V. CAPELLI, *La Divine Comédie, Entrée en lecture*, trad. de l'italien par Hervé Benoît, Genève, 2003, p. 217.

¹⁰² Traduction A. Masseron, *op. cit.*, (légèrement retouchée) : « À la [*i. e.* Béatrice, dont les regards sont fixés dans le ciel] contempler, je devins en moi-même tel que devint Glaucus, à goûter de cette herbe qui le rendit le compagnon des autres dieux ; la transhumanisation ne peut se signifier par des mots ; que l'exemple suffise à ceux à qui par la grâce est réservée l'expérience. »

¹⁰³ Sur l'ivresse transformante, cf. encore *De contemplatione* (V, 12, p. 544, l. 74-78 [182B-C]) : « Cur non et recte dicatur spiritus semetipsum non habere, quando incipit a semetipso deficere et a suo esse, in supermundanum quendam et uere plus quam humanum statum transire, et mirabili transfiguratione spiritus ille ab humano uideatur in diuinum deficere, ita ut ipse iam non sit ipse ... » Cette transformation est régulièrement mise en relations avec le texte paulinien (*II Cor.* 3, 18) : « Omnes [...] transformamur a claritate in claritatem, tanquam a Domini Spiritu. »

ces mots : pour ceux qui auront la grâce de cette expérience, ils la reconnaîtront avec l'exemple de Glaucus¹⁰⁴.

Nous pourrions certes reprendre par le menu ce Prologue, et montrer qu'il contient déjà des références qui ne sont pas étrangères au *De contemplatione*¹⁰⁵. Notons cependant que cette « transhumanisation » dit exactement ce que Richard décrit lorsqu'il invite à s'avancer au-delà de toutes les images du monde créé, à entrer dans le monde des êtres spirituels et à passer au-delà de l'esprit humain (*praeter*, c'est-à-dire en sortir par *excessus mentis*). Et n'est-il pas singulier que Dante dise de Richard (*Paradis*, X, 132) qu'il fut celui

che a considerar fu più que viro,

« qui en la contemplation fut plus qu'homme¹⁰⁶ » ? Est-ce l'« angélisation » qu'on peut déduire du texte ricardien qui introduit les deux chérubins comme symboles de la contemplation suprême¹⁰⁷ ? C'est lui qui découvrit peut-être ce qui est au-delà de la connaissance humaine. Il est groupé avec Isidore de Séville et Bède le Vénérable, l'un et l'autre illustres par leurs ouvrages savants, mais Dante met en quelque sorte à part le Victorin qui a

¹⁰⁴ Richard de même (V, 19, p. 572, l. 16-18 [192B-C]) : « Melius in hoc nos illorum peritia instruit quos ad scientie huius plenitudinem [...] propria experientia prouexit. »

¹⁰⁵ C'est le traité auquel nous limitons délibérément nos observations, pour ne pas allonger abusivement cette note. Étendre l'enquête aux autres œuvres ricardiennes nécessiterait un exposé qui dépasse l'intention du présent travail et qui serait justiciable d'une monographie particulière.

¹⁰⁶ L'expression est très forte. Elle exprime sans doute l'idée d'un dépassement de la condition humaine, l'accession à un état d'expérience mystique qui est déjà au-delà de ce que les mots peuvent dire. Henri Bergson, dans les *Les deux sources de la morale et de la religion* (*Œuvres*, Paris 1959, p. 1156 ; éd. 1940, p. 226) dit à propos du « vrai mysticisme » : « Si tous les hommes, si beaucoup d'hommes pouvaient monter aussi haut que cet homme privilégié, ce n'est pas à l'espèce humaine que la nature se fût arrêtée, car celui-là est en réalité plus qu'homme. » Dans le raccourci poétique de Dante, nous ne savons pas si le poète a pensé que Richard avait dû peu prou avoir une expérience mystique exceptionnelle pour pouvoir en parler aussi profondément, mais il laisse entendre au moins que ce dont parle Richard est bien quelque chose qui dépasse l'humaine condition, et qu'il en a eu l'intuition, sinon la révélation. Richard lui-même avoue ne pas avoir connu l'extrême degré de l'extase, mais nous ne savons quelle est la part de modestie ou de pudeur qui l'aurait retenu d'invoquer une expérience personnelle, et si la volonté de s'en référer exclusivement à l'expérience des autres attestée par les Écritures (saint Paul, saint Jean, Moïse) n'était pas une manière d'assurer l'autorité de son traité.

¹⁰⁷ En IV, 6, Richard dit que, pour atteindre cette contemplation, il faut acquérir « la forme d'un ange » (p. 390, l. 25-29 [140A-B]) : « O quotiens necesse est aurum suum in ignem mittere et iterum extrahere ... antequam angelicam formam excudat cherubinique producat. »

excellé dans l'étude de la contemplation, dépassant ainsi le champ du savoir humain pour toucher au domaine de la sagesse¹⁰⁸.

Aux vers 82-89 (*Paradis* I), le poète cherche encore à comprendre les causes, mais Béatrice lui dit (trad. Masseron, modifiée): « Tu te rends toi-même ignorant par fausses imaginations (*col falso immaginar*), en sorte que tu ne vois pas ce que tu verrais si tu les avais chassées. » On reconnaît ici un propos voisin de celui de Richard en IV, 4¹⁰⁹. Le dépassement, c'est un dépouillement de tout ce qui est encore fonctionnement humain de la pensée et en particulier de l'imagination.

Glanons encore quelques indices, dans la suite du *Paradiso*. Au chant XXIII (43-45), Dante évoque l'expérience de l'extase :

la mente mia così, tra quelle dape
fatta più grande, di sé stessa uscìo,
e che si fesse rimembrar non sape¹¹⁰.

Au chant XXVIII, Dante décrit le cercle des anges les plus proches de Dieu (vers 99 *sqq.*) attirés près du Point divin. Ils sont d'autant plus envahis de « dilection » (*diletto*, rappelle les délices du Paradis, cf. IV, 16 (p. 434, l. 67 [155C]): *ad ueritatis delicias pertingere*; mais les traducteurs disent aussi « joie », la *iocunditas*) que leur vue s'approfondit dans le Vrai, où toute intellection (*intelletto*, pour la rime, mais qui signifie bien intellect ou intelligence) s'apaise (en latin, on dirait *requiescit*, se repose¹¹¹). La connaissance n'est donc pas abolie (elle est d'un autre ordre que la connais-

¹⁰⁸ On a beaucoup spéculé sur la signification des deux « couronnes » de bienheureux, tous, à des titres divers, savants, théologiens, prédicateurs, etc. Nous y voyons surtout un parallèle où saint Bonaventure (chant XII) préside à la série des « spirituels », dont une bonne partie sont des frères mineurs, avec en outre saint Anselme, Hugues de Saint-Victor (sans mention particulière expliquant sa présence, mais ce n'est pas significatif, puisqu'il en est de même pour saint Anselme); saint Thomas de son côté préside à l'autre série (chant X), celle des docteurs et théologiens, sans que nous y lisions une opposition bien caractérisée; en tout cas il n'est guère possible de voir dans l'une les tenants d'une théologie spéculative et dans l'autre ceux, d'une théologie mystique. Richard qui est dans la première série, est d'ailleurs théologien-philosophe dans le *De Trinitate*, mais il est cité ici en tant que théoricien de la contemplation.

¹⁰⁹ *De contemplatione*, p. 384, l. 12-13 [138B]: « Si enim quantum illud contemplationis genus quilibet corporea fantasmata soleant semper obnubilare... »

¹¹⁰ Trad. Masseron: « ... ainsi, mon esprit, que cette nourriture avait rendu plus vaste, sortit de lui-même, et ne peut se souvenir de ce qui arriva alors ». Cf. dans le *De contemplatione*, l'*excessus mentis* et la *dilatatio mentis*, en particulier IV, 7 (p. 392, l. 31-32 [141B]), sur l'effet du rayonnement divin, et V, 2 et *passim*, sur la dilatation de l'esprit.

¹¹¹ *Paradis* XXVIII, 106-108:

E dei saper che tutti hanno diletto,
quanto la sua veduta si profonda
nel vero in che si queta ogn' intelletto.

sance rationnelle, cf. l'*intelligentia pura et simplex* du *De contemplatione*). Et nous lisons aux vers 109-111 (ch. XXVIII) :

Quinci si può veder come si fonda
l'esser beato ne l'atto che vede,
non in quel ch'ama, che poscia seconda¹¹².

À partir du chant XXX (vers 28 *sqq.*), il se passe aussi quelque chose de significatif. D'une part, la seule inspiration poétique qui lui vient de la vision de la gloire de Béatrice est dépassée. Le poète doit essayer désormais de dire ce qu'il voit au-delà, une fois sorti de cette vision qui lui a servi de miroir (*per speculum*), ou mieux de cristal à travers lequel il a commencé à voir les miroitements et les fulgurances de la lumière divine¹¹³. Il y a comme un saut dans un univers nouveau, non plus une succession de cercles de plus en plus larges qu'il faut parcourir par une ascension, mais un renversement, une plongée dans un infini, un dépassement de l'univers spatio-temporel¹¹⁴ pour entrer dans l'expérience de l'Être éternel où il n'y a ni lieu ni temps, et à la fois tout lieu et tout temps (cf. *De contemplatione*, IV, 17, p. 440, l. 65 *sqq.* [157C] : « Potentialiter ergo ubique est, et ubi locus est,

Trad. Masseron : « Et tu dois savoir que tous ont d'autant plus de joie que leur vue pénètre plus profondément dans le Vrai où toute intelligence trouve son repos. » Lisant ces vers, dont le sens est pourtant évident (il s'agit des anges en extase), nous ne comprenons pas pourquoi Étienne Gilson (*op. cit.*, p. 60) peut affirmer que l'esprit ne franchira le dernier degré de la « méditation encore consciente qu'à la condition d'entrer en repos, c'est-à-dire de renoncer à connaître ». Mais saint Thomas d'Aquin ne dit-il pas (*Summa Th.*, II^e II^{ae}, q. 180, a. 3) : « L'acte final et qui consomme tout, c'est la contemplation même de la vérité. » Et même, comme le relève Edmund Gardner (*Dante and the mystics*, p. 4), saint Thomas dit aussi (*Summa Th.* I^a, q. 12, a. 11, ad 2) : « [Deus]... etiam et supernaturaliter, et praeter communem ordinem, mentes aliquorum in hac carne viventium, sed non sensibus carnis utentium, usque ad visionem suae essentiae elevavit », Dieu par une action miraculeuse a pu élever des âmes, dans cette vie, jusqu'à la vision de l'essence divine.

¹¹² Trad. Masseron, p. 581 : « D'où l'on peut voir que le fondement de la béatitude est dans l'acte de voir et non dans celui d'aimer, qui ne vient qu'en second. » Cf. Richard, IV, 10 [145B-C] : « Cum tempus beneplaciti diuini aduenerit, et aura aspirantis gratie afflauerit, idoneus possit inueniri qui ad illud diuinorum secretorum spectaculum debeat admitti » (quand viendra le temps du bon vouloir de Dieu et que le souffle de la grâce inspiratrice se sera répandu sur lui, il pourra se trouver en état d'être admis à la vision des secrets divins).

¹¹³ Cf. D. OTTAVIANI, *La philosophie de la lumière chez Dante*, p. 142-143 (cf. *supra*, n. 80).

¹¹⁴ Chant XXXI, 37-38 :

io, che al divino da l'umano,
all' eterno dal tempo era venuto...

(trad. Masseron : « moi, qui étais venu de l'humain au divin, du temps à l'éternité... »). Béatrice annonçait déjà ce passage en XXIX, 11-12 : « ... l'ho visto | là 've s'appunta ogne ubi e ogne quando », j'ai vu là où tout ubi (le lieu) et tout quando (le temps) se fondent en un seul Point [notre paraphrase]. Même idée dans XXXIII (138), où Trinité divine et humanité se fondent en Un (« e come vi s'indova »).

et ubi locus non est » ; pour le temps, cf. *De Trinitate*, II, 9 [906B] : l'Incréé, Dieu, fut quand il n'y eut pas de temps ; aussi en V, 7 [953D-954A]).

C'est au chant XXXIII que nous retrouvons une description de l'expérience éminente de la contemplation divine, à partir du vers 52 :

ché la mia vista, venendo sincera
e più e più intrava per lo raggio
de l'alta luce che da sé è vera.

mon regard purifié pénètre dans le rayonnement de la haute lumière qui est le Vrai,

Da quinci innanzi il moi veder fu maggio
che 'l parlar mostra, ch'a tal vista cede,
e cede la memoria e tanto oltraggio.

De ce lieu, mon voir grandit (*dilatatur*) plus que le parler ne montre, lequel cède devant telle vision, et la mémoire défaille en [cet état] si outre¹¹⁵).

Il faudrait relire en parallèle, le *De contemplatione* V, 9 (p. 532-534 [178C-D]), pour remarquer à chaque pas les points de rencontre avec Dante¹¹⁶.

Considérons encore les vers 79-80 :

... tanto ch' i' giunsi
l'aspetto mio col valor infinito,

« au point que mon regard s'est joint avec la Puissance infinie » [trad. Masseron modifiée]).

Les vers suivants (82-84) ont donné lieu à d'infinis commentaires plus ou moins embarrassés :

Oh abbondante grazia, ond' io presunsi
ficcar lo viso par la luce eterna

¹¹⁵ *oltraggio* : les traducteurs disent « outrage », « excès » (ce dernier mot convenant si on l'entend au sens de *excessus*, outrepassement), mais n'est-ce pas d'abord, au plus près du mot, passer « outre le rayon », celui du vers 53 ? L'on voit que Dante joue sur la paronomase pour faire dire au mot *oltraggio* que la vue est allée au-delà du rayon reçu ; Dieu en effet soulève le voyant (*sublevat*) par sa lumière, comme le dit Dante en I, 75 : « Tu 'I sai che col tuo lume mi levasti ». Et nous avons déjà en I, 54, comme une manière de préparer l'image qui se continuera : « e fissi li occhi al sole oltre nostr'uso », et je fixai mes yeux sur le soleil au-delà [de ce] qu'il est d'usage. Parlar mostra (et non parlar nostro de l'éd. Masseron) ; alors qu'on lit souvent seulement : « mon voir fut plus grand que notre parler », notre mot à mot rejoint les commentateurs de l'Apocalypse (Tyconius et alii), s'agissant des mystères révélés indicibles (« ... quod facilius uideri quam dici / exprimi potest »).

¹¹⁶ « Sic utique sic humana intelligentia diuino lumine irradiata... »

tanto che la veduta vi consunsi¹¹⁷ !

Aux vers 97-102, nouvel écho de Richard :

Così la mente mia, tutta sospesa,
mirava fissa, immobile e attenta,
e sempre di mirar faceasi accesa¹¹⁸.

L'esprit reste suspendu en admiration (c'était déjà la définition de la contemplation selon Richard, I, 4 (p. 96, l. 5-6 [67D]) : « Contemplatio est libera mentis perspicacia [...] cum admiratione suspensa. »¹¹⁹ En IV, 9, Richard met cet état en parallèle avec l'extase de saint Paul (pp. 400-402, l. 15-20 [144A-B]) : « [Utinam raperemur...] ut interim mens nostra seipsam nesciret, dum in eiusmodi cherubin aspectum suspensa stupeat, in tantum ut cum apostolo dicere auderet : 'Siue in corpore, | siue extra corpus, nescio, Deus scit'. »

Finalement le poète, dans son extase, voit les trois cercles de la Trinité qui fusionnent dans l'Unité divine (cf. *De contemplatione*, IV, 8 : les deux chérubins, celui de gauche et celui de droite ; IV, 17 et 18, pour la Trinité et l'Unité). Mais dans ces cercles naît mystérieusement l'image du Dieu incarné à la face humaine (XXXIII, 130-132), mystère incompréhensible (cf. *De contemplatione*, IV, 18, qui passe en revue tous les aspects incompréhensibles de l'incarnation de Dieu), que Richard exprimait de son côté

¹¹⁷ Trad. Masseron modifiée : « Ô abondance de grâce, qui me donna l'audace de fixer mes yeux sur la lumière éternelle, tant que j'y épuisai ma faculté de voir ». Étienne Gilson qui commente selon sa thèse (« j'y perdis la vue », selon la traduction qu'il donne de ce passage), comprend surtout dans le sens d'« épuiser » l'idée que la vue disparaît ; néanmoins *consunsi* est aussi proche du latin *consummare* ; il peut en être sinon la traduction exacte, du moins, par un procédé éminemment poétique, un équivalent que la proximité entre *consummare* et *consumere* suscite (conformément au latin ecclésiastique qui a déjà opéré ce rapprochement) et peut donc prendre le sens d'« aller à l'extrême limite de ses possibilités », et d'une certaine façon atteindre à son point extrême d'accomplissement. On peut lire chez Dante, dans le *Convivio*, III, ix, 14-15 (éd. PÉZARD, *Œuvres complètes*, p. 402), que la vue se modifie lorsqu'elle s'épuise par excès. Dès lors la vue charnelle s'efface (se transforme) pour laisser la place à la vue spirituelle, la vue parfaite (accomplie) du *status gloriae*. Il faut également se reporter à V, 10 (p. 536, l. 27-31 [179C-D]), où notre Victorin évoque la transmutation de l'aurore quand elle entre dans la pleine clarté et l'ardeur extrême du soleil, au point de se confondre avec la lumière (divine) du soleil (...*promotionisque consummationem, quae quidem quasi ab aurora incipit, et tandem aliquando in se solis similitudinem trahit*), où le mot *consummatio* signifie l'achèvement de cette progression, son accomplissement (voir *supra*, n. 36 la métaphore de l'aurore).

¹¹⁸ Trad. Masseron (modifiée) : « Ainsi mon esprit, tout en suspens, contemplait figé, immobile et attentif, et de cette admiration s'enflammait toujours plus. »

¹¹⁹ L'image de l'esprit suspendu et figé dans l'admiration, immobile, se lit aussi en IV, 10 (p. 404, l. 24 *sqq.* [145C]), avec une nuance d'impatience, où l'esprit en outre s'enflamme de désir pour les réalités divines.

par les regards croisés des chérubins où transparaissait le propitiatoire qui contient l'image du divin dans l'homme (IV, 20), la sagesse de l'homme au sens noble. Et Richard ajoute une allusion claire au fait que c'est la Sagesse divine, le Fils, qui s'est incarné, rejoignant l'image-vestige (cf. l'homme créé à l'image de Dieu, *Genèse*, 1, 26) et lui redonnant sa dignité. De ce mystère, Richard nous dit que le Fils incarné ne s'est pas éloigné du Père, qu'il est la Voix (*Verbum*), et que cela demeure incompréhensible (relevant du chérubin de la dissimilitude¹²⁰). De même Dante s'avoue incapable de comprendre rationnellement (134-135): « ... e non ritrova / pensando... ». Il achève son poème en reconnaissant que l'expérience de ce contact avec la lumière divine fulgurante qui frappe son esprit (140-141): « ... la mia mente fu percossa / da un fulgore... ») fait que sa « haute fantaisie » (toute capacité d'imaginer ce mystère) défaille et qu'il est emporté par l'amour (celui qui est Dieu mouvant toutes choses, l'Esprit saint)¹²¹.

Si nous avons pris la liberté de nous étendre sur les points de rencontre qu'on peut relever par une lecture parallèle du *De contemplatione* et du *Paradiso*, c'est d'abord pour essayer de montrer l'accord qu'on peut déceler entre les thèses ricardiennes d'une extase comme connaissance transcendante et transformante, et la description de l'expérience extatique que fait Dante, qui est aussi une « connaissance » extraordinaire et sublimée. Mais c'est aussi un peu pour rétablir un équilibre, les commentateurs de Dante citant abondamment saint Thomas, saint Bernard, saint Bonaventure, mais rarement Richard (sauf bien sûr Edmund Gardner, l'érudit anglais, et Mira Mocan que nous avons mentionnés). Le Victorin méritait qu'on rétablisse quelque peu son importance dans l'inspiration de Dante. Mais il est bien évident, que nous ne prétendons pas en faire l'inspirateur unique ou principal. La richesse du poème dantesque ne le permettrait pas¹²².

¹²⁰ Cf. *De contemplatione*, IV, 20 (p. 456, l. 66-68 [162D-163A]): « Si tibi mirum sit quomodo solus Filius, Patris uidelicet sapientia, incarnatus sit, quomodo in carne ad nos uenit, et tamen a Patre non recessit, perpende ... »

¹²¹ Cf. *idem*, IV, 10 (p. 406, l. 32-35 [145B-D]): « Debet itaque in nobis crescere semper et ex cognitione dilectio, et nichilominus ex dilectione cognitio, et mutuis incrementis, mutua incrementa ministrare debent, et alternis augmentis alterna augmenta accrescere habent. » Dans le *De contemplatione*, il y a aussi passage de l'esprit dans l'Esprit [divin]; cf. par ex. IV, 15 (p. 428, l. 56-57 [153D]): « et spiritus ille, qui Domino adheret, unus spiritus fiat »; tout V, 12.

¹²² Nous aurions pu aussi mener l'enquête sur l'ensemble de la Comédie, voire sur l'ensemble de l'œuvre de Dante. Ce qui apparaîtrait, c'est qu'on y trouverait trace de plusieurs thèmes qui sont, pour beaucoup, des thèmes traversant toute la littérature médiévale consacrée à la contemplation du divin. Il serait donc bien difficile de vouloir privilégier Richard dans ce panorama des influences et des sources possibles. Mais il nous semble aussi abusif de limiter celles-ci de manière presque exclusive à la pensée franciscaine, et nommément à saint Bonaventure. Quant à la *quaestio difficilis*, celle de la nature de l'extase que décrit Dante, il

4. *Un bilan*

Nous avons pu nous rendre compte, en suivant l'évolution de l'influence de Richard de Saint-Victor, qu'il a été beaucoup lu au Moyen Âge. Il a continué à être mentionné comme une autorité jusqu'au XVII^e siècle et même au-delà, et ses écrits sur la contemplation ont été appréciés¹²³, mais l'influence prépondérante du Pseudo-Aréopagite l'a progressivement éclipsé et il a souffert d'interprétations hâtives et parfois mal fondées. Le *Beniamin minor*, traduit très tôt en langue vernaculaire, a certes reçu un large accueil et a monopolisé l'attention des contemplatifs et des théologiens qui cherchaient à connaître la doctrine mystique de Richard: il conservera encore longtemps des lecteurs, à travers notamment les traductions qui le mettront à la portée d'un large public, alors que le *De contemplatione* sera réservé à des lecteurs plus cultivés, sinon érudits. Dante, en dehors des milieux monastiques, apparaît comme une exception notable. Les réflexions poursuivies dans les milieux préoccupés de vie contemplative et qui cherchaient à la pratiquer, ont été progressivement dominées par le courant mystique orienté vers une expérience plus affective que cognitive (le prestige des textes de saint Bernard y est pour beaucoup). L'influence de Richard s'est estompée, parallèlement d'ailleurs à une progressive éclipse de celle de l'École de Saint-Victor. Le lyrisme d'un Jean de la Croix ou d'une Hadewijch d'Anvers exercera désormais un attrait plus grand sur les lecteurs qui y entendront l'écho d'expériences personnelles fascinantes, alors que Richard ne livre pas de confiance et s'impose une distance et une objectivité prudentes moins séduisantes, même s'il laisse parler le maître spirituel toujours présent en lui, encourageant son auditoire à affronter une discipline propre à ouvrir des voies nouvelles vers l'expérience du divin. De même, sainte Thérèse d'Avila, les mystiques rhéno-flamands, maître Eckhart et d'autres vont davantage inspirer les diverses écoles de spiritualité. Nous pouvons dire, avec Jean Châtillon, que notre Victorin cesse « peu à peu d'être un maître que l'on suit pour devenir un auteur que l'on cite¹²⁴. »

est délicat d'argumenter sur un terrain qui relève davantage de l'affirmation doctrinale que d'une véritable analyse des expériences et des témoignages, lesquels eux-mêmes sont, comme chacun sait, très subjectifs et non vérifiables. De même en ce qui concerne son caractère noétique au moins autant qu'affectif, sinon plus, la parenté de pensée est manifeste (cf. *supra*, note 112). Quand le poète avoue sa dette à l'égard de Richard, ce n'est pas un vain mot.

¹²³ Voir notre aperçu dans notre édition, pp. 624-632 et l'article de Jean Châtillon dans le *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (cf. note 2, *supra*)

¹²⁴ J. CHÂTILLON, *D. S.*, t. 13, col. 650.

Summary

The *De contemplatione* (*Beniamin maior*) of Richard of St. Victor († 1173) is regarded as the first theoretical treatise on contemplation to have been written in the West. It is based on Biblical accounts and on an allegorical exegesis of the Ark of the Covenant. It is a text partly unknown. While the *Beniamin minor* benefited early from translations into the vernacular, guaranteeing a wide dissemination among the contemplative orders, the *Beniamin maior* had only a limited readership, mostly among the literati. The reception of the work in the thirteenth century reveals the root causes of its increasing obliteration and the first signs of misunderstandings. The Victorine Thomas Gallus cites it, but deviates from it to refer to Dionysius the Pseudo-Areopagite, who becomes the canonical author in this field. This is further confirmed by Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventure. Hugh of Balma mentions the *De contemplatione*, criticizing it on the basis of the theses of Dionysius, and by confusing the treatise of Richard with a text by Hugh of St. Victor, he inaugurates a series of misinterpretations. Guigues du Pont often uses the vocabulary of Richard, but his reading is from a Dionysian perspective. So we can see the development of a tradition of reading that only retains a few of Richard's definitions (always the same ones), and his division into six types, neglecting his exposition of the complexities of the ecstatic experience. However, Dante Alighieri is an exception: he comes on the scene as an informed reader of Richard. In the *Paradiso* he praises Richard and is extremely close to him conceptually on the supreme mystical experience.

Le *De contemplatione* (*Beniamin maior*) de Richard de Saint-Victor († 1173) passe pour le premier traité théorique sur la contemplation composé en Occident; il se fonde sur les récits bibliques et sur une exégèse allégorique de l'arche d'alliance. C'est un texte en partie méconnu. Alors que le *Beniamin minor* bénéficia très tôt de traductions en langue vulgaire lui garantissant une large diffusion chez les contemplatifs, le *Beniamin maior* n'a eu qu'un lectorat limité, essentiellement lettré. La réception de l'œuvre au XIII^e siècle fait apparaître les premières causes d'un effacement progressif et les premiers signes de malentendus. Le Victorin Thomas Gallus le cite, mais s'en écarte pour se référer à Denys le Pseudo-Aréopagite qui devient l'auteur canonique en ce domaine. Cela se vérifie encore chez Thomas d'Aquin et Bonaventure. Hugues de Balma mentionne le *De contemplatione*, le critique en s'appuyant sur les thèses dionysiennes, et, en confondant le traité ricardien avec un texte de Hugues de Saint-Victor, inaugure une série d'interprétations erronées. Guigues du Pont utilise souvent le vocabulaire de Richard, mais le lit dans la perspective dionysienne. On voit ainsi se développer une tradition de lecture qui ne retiendra de Richard que quelques définitions, toujours les mêmes, et la division en six genres, négligeant ses développements sur les aspects complexes de l'expérience extatique. En revanche, Dante d'Alighieri représente une exception: il apparaît comme un lecteur avisé de Richard; dans le *Paradiso*, il en fait l'éloge et manifeste une grande proximité de conception sur l'expérience mystique suprême.

Non est crimen amor
Lateinische Liebesdichtung im Umkreis
des Petrus Abaelardus*

Carsten WOLLIN

(*Buchholz in der Nordheide*)

Rolf Köhn gewidmet

Les thèmes sont rares ! ... Parce qu'il y a pas de thèmes : la nature, Dieu, la vie, la mort, l'amitié, l'amour et l'amitié, c'est la même chose. L'amitié, l'amour, la fraternité, la solidarité, ce qu'on appelait tout à l'heure la tendresse, à propos de la femme avec qui on vit, tout ça c'est la même chose. On englobe tout ça sous le terme « amour ». Il n'y a rien d'autre. Enfin, il y a peut-être d'autres choses, mais ça m'a échappé jusqu'ici. Rappelez-vous toujours que vous êtes sur la terre pour continuer l'espèce, uniquement.

Georges Brassens¹

Die Liebesgeschichte zwischen dem Philosophen Petrus Abaelardus und seiner Schülerin Heloisa ist so berühmt und selbst in ihren Details so allgemein bekannt, dass sie hier nicht mehr eigens vorgestellt zu werden braucht. All unser Wissen verdanken wir einer einzigen Quelle: einem autobiographischen Brief Abaelards, dem die Moderne den Titel *Historia calamitatum* gegeben hat, und dem anschließenden Briefwechsel mit Heloisa². Allerdings wurden diese Briefe mehr als ein Jahrzehnt nach den

* Der Aufsatz geht auf einen Vortrag zurück, der am 7. Januar 2010 im Historischen Institut der Universität Duisburg-Essen in Essen gehalten wurde.

¹ Aus einem Gespräch zwischen Georges Brassens und Philippe Nemo im Jahre 1979; zitiert nach nach Martin MONESTIER / Pierre BARLATIER, *Brassens, le livre du souvenir* (Paris 1982) p. 194.

² *PL* 178, col. 113-326; Jacques MONFRIN (Hrsg.), *Abélard, Historia calamitatum* (Paris ³1967). Maßgeblich ist jetzt die seit langem erwartete Ausgabe von David LUSCOMBE (Hrsg.), *The Letter Collection of Peter Abelard and Heloise* (Oxford 2013). – Der Titel

Ereignissen verfasst, als Abaelard schon Abt des Klosters Saint-Gildas in der Bretagne war (ca. 1127-1132) und Heloisa Priorin und später Äbtissin des Paraklet (ab 1129). Beide berichten hier von den Liebesgedichten, welche Abaelard während ihrer Liebesaffäre gedichtet hatte. Interessant ist für uns Abaelards Bemerkung, dass diese Lieder in allen Teilen Frankreichs von Menschen gesungen wurden, die selbst verliebt waren (... *quorum etiam carminum pleraque adhuc in multis, sicut et ipse nosti, frequentantur et decantantur regionibus, ab his maxime, quos uita similis oblectat*). Dazu gehörten, wie Heloisa berichtet, sogar die Laien, die von der Schönheit der Melodien berückt diese nachsangen, selbst wenn sie nicht allzu viel von dem (lateinischen) Text verstanden (... *ut illitteratos etiam melodie dulcedo tui non sineret immemores esse*)³.

Diese *Carmina amatoria* Abaelards haben die Gelehrten seit dem Erstdruck des Briefwechsels im Jahre 1616 gesucht, aber bis heute nicht gefunden. Es ist nicht einmal sicher, ob sie nur verschollen, oder aber in den Zeitläuften völlig untergegangen sind. Keine mittelalterliche Handschrift nennt Abaelard als Dichter von Liebesliedern, kein Zeitgenosse zitiert diese namentlich. Wir kennen auch keine Liebesgedichte, welche die Namen von Abaelard und Heloisa nennen oder direkt auf ihre Liebesaffäre anspielen würden, während satirische Epigramme sich dieser Ereignisse durchaus annehmen⁴. In den handschriftlichen Sammlungen von Abaelards Schriften, welche schon seine Schüler, aber auch noch spätere Kenner anlegten, sind ebenfalls keine Liebesgedichte überliefert.

Auch der Stilvergleich als Mittel der Heuristik bleibt uns verwehrt, denn Abaelard zeigt in den erhaltenen religiösen und moralischen Dichtungen eine erstaunliche formale und stilistische Vielseitigkeit. Virtuos beherrscht er die Formen des gereimten Hexameters, des reimlosen elegischen Distichons, des Figurengedichts, des strophischen Hymnus und der freien Sequenz. Daher können wir also nicht einmal mutmaßen, wie seine *Carmina amatoria* ausgesehen haben könnten. Selbst die philologische Erforschung der in Abaelards Schriften häufig wiederkehrenden Gedanken, Topoi und Sentenzen steckt noch immer in den Kinderschuhen. Die Edi-

nach Abaelards eigener Formulierung: epist. 1, 74 (*PL* 178, col. 180 C; *MONFRIN*, p. 107; *LUSCOMBE*, p. 118): *Hec ... de calamitatum mearum hystoria ... scripsisse sufficiat*.

³ Abaelard. epist 1, 19; *PL* 178, col. 128 C; *MONFRIN* (n. 2) p. 73; *LUSCOMBE* (n. 2) pp. 28. 30. – Heloisa epist 2, 13; *PL* 178, col. 185 D – 186 A; *MONFRIN* (n. 2) p. 115; *LUSCOMBE* (n. 2) p. 136.

⁴ Vgl. Peter DRONKE, *Abelard and Heloise in Medieval Testimonies* (W. P. Ker Memorial Lecture 26; Glasgow 1976) pp. 19-21, 45-48; wieder in: ID., *Intellectuals and Poets in Medieval Europe* (Storia e letteratura 183; Roma 1992) pp. 247-294, hier pp. 262-265, 280-284; Carsten WOLLIN, «Dactilico metro vacuus. Ein Epigramm über die Kastration des Petrus Abaelardus», *Sacris Erudiri* 50 (2011) pp. 483-490.

tionen bieten hierzu nur selten Hinweise, so dass man völlig auf die eigene Lektüre angewiesen ist. Da also alle Voraussetzungen für eine Stilanalyse fehlen, ist es nur allzu verständlich, dass die Mehrzahl der Forscher resigniert hat und Abaelards Liebedichtung für verloren hält. Das hat aber phantasiebegabte Menschen nicht davon abgehalten, sondern vielmehr dazu angespornt, die unterschiedlichsten Hypothesen und Zuschreibungen zu ersinnen, doch ohne dass von ihnen bis heute auch nur ein einziges überzeugendes Indiz, von einem Beweis gar nicht zu reden, vorgelegt worden wäre⁵.

Einen anderen, weit erfolgversprechenderen Weg hatte einer der Begründer der Mittellateinischen Philologie in Deutschland eingeschlagen. So entdeckte Wilhelm Meyer auf einer Bibliotheksreise 1873-74 in der Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana zu Florenz eine kleine Sammlung von neun lateinischen Liedern, die *Carmina Florentina*, welche im Folgenden noch eine zentrale Rolle spielen wird. Meyer bemerkte bei der Edition von zwei Gedichten eine deutliche Zitatbeziehung zwischen der Sequenz *Parce continuis* (CF 6) und den *Planctus* Abaelards. Die sprachliche und gedankliche Parallele bewog ihn dazu, *Parce continuis* Abaelard zuzuschreiben, wenn auch mit einem großen Fragezeichen⁶. Doch galt der Rechtsgrundsatz *Unus testis nullus testis*, so dass die Forschung diesen Hinweis nicht ausnutzte. Da eine vollständige Edition dieser Liedersammlung bis heute fehlt, mussten die übrigen Verbindungen zu Abaelard unbemerkt bleiben.

Später versuchten Hans Spanke, Walther Lipphardt und zuletzt Therese Latzke die verlorenen *Carmina amatoria* Abaelards, oder wenigstens ihren Nachklang, im Kreis seiner Schüler wiederzufinden⁷, namentlich unter den Gedichten des Hilarius von Orléans und einer kleinen Gruppe von Liebesliedern der *Carmina Burana* (CB 88a, 95, 116-121), welche man nach Lipphardt mit großer Vorsicht als « Kreis um Hilarius » bezeichnen kann. Da Abaelards Gedichte aber weiterhin unbekannt blieben, ließen sich keine sinnvollen Vermutungen über ihre Form, Stil und Inhalt anstellen. Mögli-

⁵ Ich nenne nur die bekanntesten: Ludwig EHRENTHAL, *Studien zu den Liedern der Vaganten* (Programm Bromberg; Bromberg 1891) pp. 1-12, hier pp. 5-8; Constant J. MEWS, *The Lost Love Letters of Heloise and Abelard* (New York 1999, ²2008).

⁶ Wilhelm MEYER, « Zwei mittellateinische Lieder in Florenz », in: *Studi letterari e linguistici dedicati a Pio Rajna* (Firenze 1911) pp. 149-166.

⁷ Hans SPANKE, « Rezension von Otto Schumann, *Carmina Burana*, Bd. I, 2 », *Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie* 64 (Nr. 1-2) (1943) col. 35-46, hier col. 42-43; Walther LIPPHARDT, « Unbekannte Weisen zu den *Carmina Burana* », *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 12 (1955) pp. 122-142, hier pp. 130-132; Therese LATZKE, « Abaelard, Hilarius und das Gedicht 22 der Ripollsammlung », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 8 (1973) pp. 70-89; EAD., « Die *Carmina erotica* der Ripollsammlung », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 10 (1975) pp. 138-201; EAD., « Das Verwahrungsgedicht mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der *Carmina Burana* 95 und 117 », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 11 (1976) pp. 151-176.

che Anklänge konnten nicht entdeckt werden, solange man nicht wusste, wonach man suchen sollte.

Durch die Kombination von Überlieferungsgeschichte und Zitatbeziehungen gelang es schließlich Dieter Schaller, ein Gedicht zu ermitteln, welches bei dem Abaelard-Schüler Hilarius, dem anonymen Dichter der *Carmina Riuipullensia* und anderen Zeitgenossen so bekannt und beliebt gewesen sein muss, dass man daraus gerne Zitate entnahm oder es imitierte⁸. Es handelt sich um das Lied *Lingua mendax et dolosa* (CB 117), welches zuvor schon Spanke und Lipphardt dem hypothetischen « Kreis um Hilarius » zugeordnet hatten. Mit großer Zurückhaltung formuliert Schaller die Möglichkeit, dass hier, am mutmaßlichen Anfang der Rezeptionskette, tatsächlich eins der verlorenen Liebesgedichte Abaelards stehen könnte.

1. Das Fragment in Bloomington und die *Carmina Florentina*

Der entscheidende Hinweis auf die so lange gesuchte Liebeslyrik Abaelards steht auf einem einzelnen Handschriftenblatt, welches ein gnädiger Zufall 800 Jahre lang vor der Vernichtung bewahrt hat. Auf diesem Fragment aus einer verlorenen (oder noch nicht identifizierten) Handschrift des 12. Jahrhunderts finden sich zwischen ganz unterschiedlichen Einträgen auch vier rhythmische Zeilen mit dem Beginn *Iuuenum religio*, welche der Schreiber namentlich *Petrus Abailardus* zuweist. Wo die Handschrift geschrieben wurde und wie sie im 19. Jahrhundert in den Besitz von Sir Thomas Phillipps gelangte, ist unbekannt. Über einige Umwege kam das Blatt mit der Handschriftensammlung des amerikanischen Offiziers George A. Poole Jr. im Jahre 1958 in die Indiana University Library in Bloomington, wo es heute als Poole mss. Fragment 99 aufbewahrt wird. Erstmals machte 1962 der Handschriftencensus der Vereinigten Staaten und Kanadas auf das Blatt und die Autorangabe aufmerksam. Eine Transkription der vier Verse erschien dann 1985 in der *Checklist* von Julia Barrow, Charles Burnett und David Luscombe⁹. Aber auch jetzt hatte man die Herkunft des Fragments noch nicht erkannt, denn man hielt es irrtümlich für einen Auszug aus (oder eine Parallelfassung in rhythmischen Versen zu) Abaelards *Carmen ad Astralabium*. Die Identifikation gelang mir im Feb-

⁸ Dieter SCHALLER, « Bemerkungen zu einigen Texten der mittellateinischen Liebeslyrik in P. Dronkes neuer Edition », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 5 (1968) pp. 7-17, hier pp. 10-11.

⁹ Julia BARROW / Charles BURNETT / David LUSCOMBE, « A checklist of the manuscripts containing the writings of Peter Abelard and Heloise and other works closely associated with Abelard and his school », *Revue d'histoire des textes* 14/15 (1984/1985) pp. 183-302, hier p. 194, § 19 und p. 269, § 355.

ruar 2008: Die vier Verse *Iuuenum religio* sind in Wirklichkeit nämlich ein Zitat aus dem Liebeslied *Primo quasdam eligo* (CF 8), welches vollständig nur in der von Wilhelm Meyer entdeckten Liedersammlung der *Carmina Florentina* erhalten ist¹⁰.

Die neun Lieder der *Carmina Florentina* (CF) sind geschlossen allein in einer französischen Statius-Handschrift des 12. Jahrhunderts (Florenz, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Cod. Aedil. 197)¹¹ erhalten, wo sie auf zwei am Ende freigebliebenen Blättern (fol. 131r-132v) von einer nur wenig späteren Hand eingetragen wurden. Wir dürfen annehmen, dass die Gedichtsammlung ebenfalls aus Frankreich stammt und dort aufgezeichnet wurde, noch bevor der Codex einen italienischen Besitzer fand. Die Parallelüberlieferung, die literarischen Anspielungen, die weitgespannte Rezeption und die Verstechnik sprechen für eine Entstehungszeit der Lieder ungefähr in der ersten Hälfte des 12. Jahrhunderts.

Da der Florentiner Codex jedoch weder Überschriften noch Verfasseramen angibt, lässt es sich kaum mehr feststellen, ob alle Gedichte aus der Feder eines Dichters stammen oder erst von einem Sammler in dieser Form zusammengestellt wurden. Immerhin können einige kleinere Gruppen mit Hilfe stilistischer und formaler Kriterien unterschieden werden. Wenn also *Primo quasdam eligo* (CF 8) auf dem Fragment in Bloomington namentlich Abaelard zugewiesen wird, dann muss das nicht zwangsläufig bedeuten, dass wir in den *Carmina Florentina* Abaelards Liederbuch vor uns hätten. Dennoch hat ein erster Vergleich mit den übrigen Dichtungen Abaelards schon eine Reihe von ganz erstaunlichen inhaltlichen, stilistischen und sprachlichen Übereinstimmungen ans Licht gebracht, so dass eine Verbindung der kleinen Liedersammlung mit Abaelard außer Frage steht, wie auch immer diese ausgesehen haben mag¹². Auch wenn es fraglich bleiben muss, ob Abaelard tatsächlich der Dichter von *Primo quasdam eligo* ist, oder ob möglicherweise weitere seiner Gedichte in den *Carmina Florentina* verborgen sind, so haben wir doch eine Liedersammlung wiedergefunden, welche Abaelard selbst zumindest bekannt war und welche nachweislich auch von seinen Schülern gesungen und imitiert wurde. Aber

¹⁰ Carsten WOLLIN, « Ein Liebeslied des Petrus Abaelardus in Bloomington (Indiana) », *Revue Bénédictine* 119 (2009) pp. 121-163, hier pp. 126-127 ein Faksimile des Blattes. – Eine Neuausgabe der *Carmina Florentina* bereite ich vor.

¹¹ Beschrieben wird der Codex bei Angelo Maria BANDINI, *Bibliotheca Leopoldina Laurentiana seu catalogus manuscriptorum ...*, Bd. 1 (Florenz 1791) col. 505-506; MEYER (n. 6); Maurice DELBOUILLE, « Trois poésies latines inédites », in: *Mélanges Paul Thomas* (Bruges 1930) pp. 174-186; Birger MUNK OLSEN, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, vol. 2 (Paris 1985) pp. 533-534; Harald ANDERSON, *The Manuscripts of Statius, Revised Edition* (Arlington Virginia 2009) vol. 1, pp. 99-100.

¹² Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) pp. 138-149.

nicht nur wegen ihrer historischen Bedeutung verdienen es die *Carmina Florentina*, einem größeren Publikum bekannt gemacht zu werden, sondern auch wegen ihres künstlerischen Wertes, ihres gedanklichen Gehalts und der zeitlosen Gültigkeit der hier dargestellten menschlichen Verhaltensweisen.

2. Der Kreis des Hilarius von Orléans

Eine weitere überraschende Entdeckung war es, dass wir bei der Suche nach Gedichten aus dem Umkreis Abaelards bei den *Carmina Florentina* nicht stehen zu bleiben brauchen, sondern dass diese uns direkt zu der kleinen, oben erwähnten Gruppe in den *Carmina Burana* (CB 88, 88 a, 95, 116-121) führen, welche schon Hans Spanke und Walther Lipphardt¹³ einem hypothetischen «Kreis des Hilarius von Orléans», eines Zeitgenossen und Schülers Abaelards¹⁴, zugerechnet hatten. Als Argumente nennen die beiden Forscher die Formparallelen und Zitatbeziehungen zu den Gedichten des Hilarius, die Parallelüberlieferung in der Liederhandschrift C aus der Klosterbibliothek von Saint-Martial in Limoges (Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 3719, um 1150 geschrieben), die Sprachmischung von Latein und Französisch in CB 118, die Rezeption in den um 1170 entstandenen *Carmina Riuipullensia*¹⁵ und schließlich inhaltliche Parallelen zur altfranzösischen Lyrik (CB 121). Nun hat sich aber gezeigt, dass wenigstens einige Lieder dieser Gruppe (CB 95, 117, 120) ebenso deutliche Zitatbeziehungen zu den *Carmina Florentina* wie zu Abaelards authentischem *Carmen ad Astralabium* aufweisen. Aus diesem Grunde habe ich schon an anderer Stelle dafür plädiert, die Bezeichnung «Kreis des Hilarius» durch «Kreis Abaelards» zu ersetzen und die von Lipphardt vorgeschlagene Datierung um 1150 in die Jahre 1100-1140 vorzuverlegen¹⁶.

Es ist sicherlich nicht unangebracht, in wenigen Worten zu umreißen, was wir uns unter dem «Kreis Abaelards» vorstellen können. Die genannten

¹³ SPANKE (n. 7) col. 42-43; LIPPHARDT (n. 7) pp. 130-132; es heißt auf p. 132: «All dies sind Studentenlieder, die mit großer Wahrscheinlichkeit unter dem Einfluß der Dichterpersönlichkeit des Hilarius um 1150 in Paris entstanden sind.» – Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) pp. 149-155 mit neuerer Literatur.

¹⁴ Nikolaus M. HÄRING, «Hilary of Orleans and His Letter Collection», *Studi medievali* III 14 (1973) pp. 1069-1122; ID., «Die Gedichte und Mysterienspiele des Hilarius von Orléans», *Studi medievali* III 17 (1976) pp. 915-968; Walther BULST / Marie Luise BULST-THIELE (Hrsg.), *Hilarii Aurelianensis versus et ludi, epistolae, ludus Danielis Belouacensis* (Mittelateinische Studien und Texte 16; Leiden 1989).

¹⁵ LATZKE, «Die Carmina erotica der Ripollsammlung» (n. 7); José-Luis MORALEJO (Hrsg.), *Cancionero de Ripoll* (Barcelona 1986).

¹⁶ WOLLIN (n. 10) pp. 155-160.

Lieder waren nicht Teil einer intimen Korrespondenz oder ausschließlich für den Vortrag vor der Geliebten gedacht, sondern für die Aufführung vor einem größeren Publikum¹⁷. An wen anders sollte man hierbei denken, wenn nicht an die zahlreichen Schüler und Freunde Abaelards, die beim fröhlichen Zusammensein sicherlich auch ihrerseits mit eigenen Liedern zur Unterhaltung beitrugen, wofür uns Hilarius ein Beispiel bietet. Diese Schüler haben dann für die rasche und weite Verbreitung von Abaelards Liebesliedern gesorgt, so dass man sie bald nicht nur in Paris, sondern auch in den entlegensten Provinzen sang. Von diesen Liedern lässt sich vorerst nur *Primo quasdam eligo* (CF 8) Abaelard mit einiger Sicherheit zuweisen. Andere Lieder hat er vielleicht nur gerne vorgetragen, mitgesungen oder angehört, auch wenn sie nicht aus seiner eigenen Feder stammten. In anderen hingegen erweisen die Schüler ihrem verehrten Meister ein Kompliment, indem sie seine Lieder zitieren oder auf sie anspielen. So zitiert Hilarius in seinem an Abaelard gerichteten Bittgedicht *Lingua serui, lingua perfidie* (carm. 6) den französischen Refrain aus einem Lied (CB 95) seines Lehrers. Ein anderer Anhänger dichtet den *Planctus Plange planctu nimio*¹⁸ auf Abaelards Verurteilung in Sens (1140), indem er sich die Form des *Planctus super Saul et Ionatha* zum Vorbild nimmt, aber auch eine Anspielung an CF 3 einfügt. Wohl auch in späterer Zeit haben Dichter, wie der Anonymus von Ripoll, Abaelards Lieder nachgeahmt, aber ohne den Philosophen selbst kennengelernt zu haben, vielleicht sogar ohne den Namen ihres Vorbildes zu kennen.

3. Das Züricher Florilegium

Seit einem Aufsatz Wilhelm Wackernagels aus dem Jahr 1845¹⁹ ist der Mediävistik das große poetische Florilegium bekannt, in welchem ein schwäbischer Kleriker am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts eine umfangreiche Blütenlese aus der modernen Dichtung Frankreichs mit eigener Hand notiert hat. Der Inhalt der wertvollen Handschrift, welche heute in der Zentralbibliothek in Zürich als Ms. C. 58 liegt, wurde 1904/5 in großen Teilen von Johann Jakob Werner abgedruckt²⁰. Unter den poetischen Par-

¹⁷ Vgl. Dieter SCHALLER, « Gattungs- und Formtypen in den Carmina Burana amatoria », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 36/1 (2001) pp. 77-93, hier pp. 77-82.

¹⁸ WIC fehlt; *Checklist* § 393; ediert von Franz Josef WORSTBROCK, « Ein Planctus auf Petrus Abaelard », *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 16 (1981) pp. 166-173; wieder in: ID., *Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol. 1 (Stuttgart 2004) pp. 9-16. – Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) p. 143.

¹⁹ Wilhelm WACKERNAGEL, « Gedichte des Archipoeta Waltherus », *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum* 5 (1845) pp. 293-299.

²⁰ Johann Jakob WERNER, *Beiträge zur Kunde der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Aarau 1905; Reprint Hildesheim 1979); Jean-Yves TILLIETTE, « Le sens et la composition

tien findet man nicht nur einen kleinen Abschnitt, der mindestens fünf sichere Abaelardiana enthält, sondern unmittelbar vorangehend zwei äußerst frei und originell gestaltete metrische Liebesepisteln eines Mannes an seine Geliebte (Z 48 *Omne felici te Musa salutat amici*; Z 49 *Dulcis amica mea, speciosior es Galatea*)²¹. Da die beiden Gedichte eine Fülle von sprachlichen, stilistischen und formalen Gemeinsamkeiten mit Abaelards authentischem Marienpreis *Lux orientalis* aufweisen, darf man vermuten, dass auch sie von einem Dichter aus dem «Kreis Abaelards» stammen, wenn nicht sogar von Abaelard selbst.

4. Themen und Formen

Es darf als ein immenser Fortschritt in der Erforschung der mittellateinischen Lyrik gelten, dass zwei kleine Liedersammlungen, insgesamt 16 Lieder, für den Umkreis Abaelards gesichert werden konnten. Trotzdem müssen wir damit rechnen, dass der Zufall der Überlieferung, die groben und unsicheren Methoden der Philologie, Übereifer und fehlgeleiteter Scharfsinn uns und andere dazu bewogen haben, dem «Kreis» des Hilarius oder Abaelards Gedichte zuzuordnen, welche mit diesen in Wirklichkeit nichts zu tun haben. Auf der anderen Seite dürfen wir vermuten, dass in den *Carmina Burana* und anderen Gedichtsammlungen vielleicht noch authentische Lieder Abaelards verborgen sind, ohne dass es jemals gelingen wird, diese ausfindig zu machen. Angesichts all dieser Unsicherheiten werde ich im Folgenden darauf verzichten, einzelne Gedichte Abaelard zuzuweisen. Stattdessen bezeichne ich den Autor eines Gedichts nur mit dem anonym gedachten Wort «der Dichter», ohne dass damit eine Zuschreibung an einen bestimmten Autor präjudiziert werden soll.

Schon eine erste Lektüre der *Carmina Florentina* zeigt uns, dass wir es, mit Ausnahme von CF 9, welches den Streit zwischen Pallas Athene und Venus beschreibt, fast ausschließlich mit Gedichten zu tun haben, welche aus der Sicht einer Persona (oder in CF 5 von zwei Personae) geschrieben sind und in denen erzählende Passagen völlig fehlen. Dasselbe gilt für die Gedichte aus den *Carmina Burana* (CB 95, 116-121), von denen CB 121 ein reiner Dialog ist. Als weitere Gemeinsamkeit können wir feststellen, dass die meisten Lieder der Gattung des Planctus angehören (CF 1-4,

du florilège de Zurich (Zentralbibliothek, ms. C 58). Hypothèses et propositions», in: Peter STOTZ / Michele C. FERRARI (Hrsg.), *Non recedet memoria eius. Beiträge zur Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters im Gedenken an Jakob Werner (1861-1944)* (Lateinische Sprache und Literatur des Mittelalters 28; Bern 1995) pp. 147-167.

²¹ Carsten WOLLIN, «Zwei metrische Liebesepisteln aus dem Kreis des Petrus Abaelardus», *Sacris Erudiri* 49 (2010) pp. 339-377.

6; CB 95, 116-120), also die Klage einer Person über das ihr zugestoßene Unglück wiedergeben. Eine dritte Gemeinsamkeit liegt in der Liebesthematik fast aller Stücke. So beschäftigen sich die *Carmina Florentina* ausschließlich mit den vielfachen Spielarten der Liebe: mit der Liebe zwischen Mann und Frau, dem Widerstreit zwischen Liebe und Studium (CF 9), der Tragik von Liebe und Freundschaft (CF 6) oder der väterlichen Hassliebe des Ödipus gegen seine Söhne (CF 3). Die *Carmina Burana* behandeln ebenfalls nur die Liebe: die Verwahrungsgedichte (CB 95, 117), die Klage eines Eifersüchtigen (CB 120), die Klage über die Abwesenheit oder die Trennung von der Geliebten (CB 116, 118, 119), der enthüllende Dialog mit dem Freund über die Qualitäten der neuen Freundin (CB 121).

Entstanden ist der Aufsatz nicht durch den Wunsch, die Gedichte der *Carmina Florentina* einer berühmten Persönlichkeit wie Abaelard zuzuschreiben, sondern durch die Beobachtung der Besonderheiten ihrer literarischen Technik und ihrer Thematik. Deshalb wende ich mich im Folgenden nur der literarischen Interpretation des neugewonnenen Textcorpus zu, wobei zwei Fragen im Vordergrund stehen: (1) Auf welche Weise lässt der empirische Dichter eine von ihm erdachte und unterschiedene Persona auftreten und welche Absichten verfolgt er mit dieser Technik? (2) Kann in den Gedichten aus dem « Kreis Abaelards » eine bestimmte Liebeskonzeption festgestellt werden?

Ausgewählt habe ich zu diesem Zweck fünf Liebesgedichte, vier aus den *Carmina Florentina* (CF 2, 5, 7 [= CB 88], 8) und zwei aus den *Carmina Burana* (CB 88 [= CF 7], 117), an welchen sich die charakteristischen Techniken und Themen gut erkennen lassen. Obgleich das Thema der Liebe beinahe alle Gedichte durchzieht, habe ich mit Absicht diejenigen ausgelassen, die sich mit antiken Stoffen beschäftigen (CF 3, 4), deren Texte so schlecht überliefert sind, dass jede Edition zu einer mehr oder weniger subjektiven Rekonstruktion werden muss (CF 6, 9; CB 118), und aus Raumgründen den eifersüchtigen Liebhaber (CF 1; CB 120). Es fehlen auch die metrischen Liebesbriefe aus dem Züricher Florilegium, welche vermutlich « echte » Briefe sind, oder sich doch wenigstens als solche geben, also in eine andere Kommunikationssituation gehören.

Zwar habe ich mich bemüht, die fünf Gedichte unter den oben genannten Fragen nach der Technik der Persona-Dichtung und der Liebeskonzeption zu interpretieren, doch ließ sich dies nicht streng durchhalten, so dass unterschiedliche Exkurse in die Interpretationen eingeschaltet werden mussten: so die medizinhistorische Erklärung der Lehre von der Übertragung der Lepra in CF 2, der Vergleich von CF 7 mit der Definition des Amor purus bei Andreas Capellanus oder die mannigfaltige Rezeption desselben Gedichts. Auch wenn keine Untersuchung der Autorschaft Abae-

lards beabsichtigt war, habe ich doch nicht darauf verzichten wollen, dem Leser die gedanklichen und sprachlichen Übereinstimmungen mit seinen Schriften wenigstens in den Fußnoten zur Hand zu geben, ohne daraus aber weitere Konsequenzen zu ziehen.

Der Frauenheld
(CF 8 *Primo quasdam eligo*)

Beginnen möchte ich meine Interpretationen mit dem Gedicht *Primo quasdam eligo* (CF 8)²², welches durch das Zitat auf dem oben erwähnten Handschriftenblatt in Bloomington *Petrus Abailardus* zugewiesen und dessen Text vollständig in den *Carmina Florentina* überliefert wird, also das entscheidende Bindeglied zwischen Abaelard und der Liedersammlung in Florenz bildet. Das Lied beginnt unvermittelt mit der Rede einer Persona, ohne dass das Vorverständnis und die Erwartungen des Hörers bzw. des Lesers durch eine Überschrift oder erzählende Einleitung vorbereitend in eine bestimmte Richtung gelenkt werden würden. Der Hörer ist also zur gedanklichen Mitarbeit gezwungen, um die Situation im Verlauf des Vortrags Stück für Stück rekonstruieren:

1 <Pr>imo quasdam eligo,
 et electas diligo,
 et dilectas subigo.
 Sum levis plus quam uentus,
 nichil in me corrigo:
 sic exigit inuentus!

Kunstvoll aufgebaut ist im ersten Satz die rhetorische Figur der Gradatio (Klimax) mit der Abfolge der drei Verben *eligo*, *diligo* und *subigo*. Hier muss der Hörer besonders schnell reagieren und die femininen Objekte (*quasdam*, *electas*, *dilectas*) als Frauen identifizieren und mit der speziellen erotischen Konnotation der Verben, besonders aber von *subigo* («ich vernasche»), kombinieren, um den Text richtig zu erfassen. Die Gradatio stellt eine vollkommene Entsprechung zwischen Inhalt und sprachlicher Gestaltung her, indem sie den sicheren und unwiderstehlichen Erfolg

²² WIC 14627. Editionen: Hennig BRINKMANN, *Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter* (Halle / Saale 1925; Reprint Tübingen 1979) pp. 33-34; Horst KUSCH, *Einführung in das lateinische Mittelalter*, vol. 1 (Berlin 1957) pp. 612-613, mit dt. Übers.; Peter DRONKE, *Medieval Latin and the Rise of European Love-Lyric* (Oxford 1968) vol. 2, pp. 366-367, mit engl. Übers.; Eugenio MASSA, *Carmina Burana e altri canti della goliardia medievale* (Roma 1979) pp. 163-164, Nr. XIII, Kom. p. 222; Pascale BOURGAIN, *Poésie lyrique latine du moyen âge* (Paris 2000) pp. 214-215, mit franz. Übers. – Der zitierte Text ist identisch mit der Neuedition in WOLLIN (n. 10) p. 131, Kom. pp. 131-133.

der Persona bei den Frauen nachzeichnet, während der namenlose Plural auf eine Vielzahl von Eroberungen schließen lässt. Möglichen Einwänden gegen die Immoralität ihrer Handlungsweise kommt die Persona zuvor, indem sie sogleich auf ihren leichten Charakter und ihre Jugend verweist.

Die begonnene Rechtfertigung setzt die Persona in der 2. Strophe fort. Die sexuelle Ausgelassenheit und Neugier der Jugend (*lasciuia*) gebieten, alles auszuprobieren und vor nichts zurückzuschrecken (*currere per omnia*). Die Macht der Liebe diktiert ihr eigenes Gesetz, welches, in der zeitgenössischen Literatur als *lex iuuentutis*²³ bezeichnet, die geltenden moralischen Gesetze außer Kraft setzt (*Nulla est infamia hic legem non habere*):

2 *In adolescencia*
 suadet nos la<s>ciuia
 currere per omnia:
 nichil iubet cauere.
 Nulla est infamia
 hic legem non habere.

Gültig ist diese *lex iuuentutis* allerdings nur für junge Menschen, wohingegen der Starrsinn der Alten unmenschlich ist. Nicht sicher ist in der 3. Strophe die Deutung des Begriffs *senis obstinacia*: verhardt der Greis in einer seinem Alter nicht länger angemessenen Liebe, oder widersetzt er sich verständnislos dem Treiben der Jugend? Eine sichere Entscheidung kann wohl kaum getroffen werden. Die « Religion » der Jugend wird nirgends gelobt, nicht nur, weil sie der christlichen Moral widerspricht, sondern vor allem, weil sie anfangs reich blüht, aber schnell wieder vertrocknet²⁴:

²³ Schon Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen, SUB, Cod. W. Meyer VIII 7) notierte die bemerkenswerten Übereinstimmungen zwischen der 2. Strophe von CF 8 und dem Conuersio-Gedicht *Dum iuuentus floruit* (WIC 4886; CB 30 = Petr. Bles. carm. 2, 9; Carsten WOLLIN [Hrsg.], *Petri Blesensis Carmina* [CC CM 128; Turnhout 1998] 375-377). Vgl. auch das anonyme Conuersio-Gedicht *Ego quondam filius mundi specialis* (WIC 5269; WERNER [n. 20] pp. 147-149) Str. 2:

Adhuc in me floruit *etas iuuentutis,*
Currebam per omnia *passibus solutis:*
Sic eram contrarius *sacris institutis,*
Vt omnino uiuerem *sine spe salutis.*

²⁴ Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) pp. 135-136; ID., « Eine moralische Tierdichtung des 12. Jahrhunderts », *Sacris Erudiri* 48 (2009) pp. 191-233, hier p. 220 (Kom. zu Str. 12 b *Pueri sanctitas, nimium perucax, leuiter repedit*). – Dieselbe Sentenz finden wir in Abaelards *Carmen ad Astralabium*, wo sie nur auf die unbeständige Religiosität des jungen Mannes bezogen wird, Astral. 655-658:

Religio iuuenis leuis est impulsio mentis,
Et tamquam torrens impetuosus aque.
Quo uehemencior est, citius siccabitur iste,
Excedensque modum, deperit ille cito.

- 3 *Senis obstinacio
est abhominacio.
Iuuenis religio
 fere nusquam laudatur:
uiret in principio,
 set in fine siccatur.*

Solange der Mann jung ist, so erklärt uns die Persona in der 4. und letzten Strophe, muss er dem übermächtigen Trieb der Natur gehorchen. Er wird immer lieben müssen. Erst wenn sein Körper im Alter erkaltet ist, wird er aufhören zu lieben:

- 4 *Dum sum in hoc tempore,
dum feruesco pectore,
dum ignis in corpore
 calet, semper amabo.
Naturali frigore
 congelatus, cessabo.*

Für das Verständnis der verschiedenen und teilweise widersprüchlichen Liebeskonzeptionen, welche in der Literatur des 12. Jahrhunderts so lebhaft diskutiert wurden, ist unser Gedicht ein zugleich frühes und wichtiges Zeugnis. Von der Persona gepriesen wird nämlich die naturgegebene Sexualität. Diesem Trieb können junge Menschen nicht widerstehen, sondern müssen ihm nachgeben und alles ausprobieren. Damit setzt die sinnliche Liebe ihr eigenes Gesetz, die *lex iuuentutis*²⁵, der christlichen Moral entgegen. Vielleicht müsste man es noch genauer formulieren: der Moral alter und zur Liebe nicht mehr fähiger Menschen, wenn man die erwähnte *senis obstinacio* (Str. 3, 2) als moralischen Widerstand gegen die Jugend auffassen möchte. Die Persona trägt geradezu ein Manifest der «Diesseitsstimmung» des 12. Jahrhunderts vor²⁶, das zugleich einen Gegenentwurf gegen das von der leibfeindlichen und asketischen Lehre der Kirche geprägte Weltbild darstellt.

Andererseits lässt der Text aber auch die Schattenseiten der hier gepriesenen *lex iuuentutis* deutlich werden. Die Liebe der Persona ist wenig mehr als egoistische Triebbefriedigung, welche für die Partnerinnen so wenig

²⁵ Vgl. die Stellennachweise bei WOLLIN (n. 10) p. 132, im Kom. zu Str. 1, 6.

²⁶ Vgl. Hennig BRINKMANN, «Diesseitsstimmung im Mittelalter», *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte* 2 (1924) pp. 721-752; ID., *Geschichte* (n. 22) p. 34. – Ich kenne nur ein Buch, in welchem der Widerstreit zwischen natürlicher Sexualität und der leibfeindlichen Moral der christlichen Kirche in der mittelalterlichen Literatur, unter einer weiteren Perspektive bis hin zu Boccaccio, behandelt wird, auch wenn ich dem Autor nicht in allen Konsequenzen folgen möchte: Aldo D. SCAGLIONE, *Nature and Love in the Late Middle Ages* (Berkeley / Los Angeles 1963).

Interesse zeigt, dass nicht einmal deren Namen, geschweige denn individuelle Eigenschaften genannt werden. Immer wieder muss ein Mädchen dem anderen Platz machen, damit die Persona ihren sexuellen Erfolg in einer neuen Affaire unter Beweis stellen kann. Schon durch ihre Sprache enthüllt die Persona in der 1. Strophe offen und durchaus selbstbewusst einen Egoismus, für den andere Menschen nur namenlos und im Plural existieren. Dass diese hedonistische Position im 12. Jahrhundert so deutlich formuliert und in einem Lied öffentlich ausgesprochen wurde, ist allein schon bemerkenswert, führt uns aber auch zu der zentralen Frage, inwieweit sie für den empirischen Autor des Gedichts und sein Publikum Gültigkeit besitzt.

Es ist deutlich geworden, dass in unserem Gedicht nicht etwa der empirische Autor, sondern eine fiktive Persona spricht. Eine Festlegung durch individuelle Namen oder historische Anspielungen fehlt völlig und würde der Allgemeingültigkeit der Aussage widersprechen. Hier protzt geradezu der Idealtypus des Don Juan mit seinen sexuellen Erfolgen. Kaum ein Zuhörer oder Leser wird sich offen mit dem naiven Egoismus der Persona identifizieren wollen.

Wie steht aber nun der Autor selbst zu dem Verhalten und den Äußerungen der von ihm geschaffenen Persona? Theoretisch ist die gesamte Skala von der Zustimmung bis zur völligen Ablehnung denkbar, also von der Identität bis zur ironischen Brechung. Ich vermute, dass der Autor, indem er seine Persona eine der herrschenden kirchlichen Moral aufs äußerste widersprechende Position einnehmen lässt, vordergründig nicht die Moral, sondern die Persona kritisiert, welche sich selbst mit ihren Ansichten außerhalb des Wertesystems stellt, dem sowohl der Autor als auch seine Zuhörer angehören²⁷.

Andererseits bleibt aber festzustellen, dass der Dichter die Persona diese Position überhaupt aussprechen lässt, denn wie leicht hätte er darauf verzichten können, das Gedicht in dieser Form zu schreiben oder vorzutragen. Er muss also seine Freude daran gehabt haben, die Verherrlichung der

²⁷ Vgl. Durant Waite ROBERTSON JR., « The Subject of the De Amore of Andreas Capellanus », *Modern Philology* 50 (1953) pp. 145-161; ID., *A Preface to Chaucer. Studies in Medieval Perspectives* (Princeton N. J. 1962) pp. 391-448. – Robertson nimmt an, dass die christlichen Moralvorstellungen das Denken des mittelalterlichen Menschen in einem solchen Maße beherrschten, dass davon abweichende Meinungen entweder verschwiegen werden mussten oder aber nur geäußert werden konnten, um sie sogleich zu bekämpfen und zu widerlegen. Wird also in der Literatur eine dem Christentum widersprechende Meinung vertreten, dann geschieht das nur in einer ironisch-parodistischen Brechung, mit deren Hilfe sich der Autor von den Äußerungen seiner Persona abgrenzt. Was man an Robertson oft und zu Recht kritisiert hat, war, dass er diesen hermeneutischen Schlüssel generell, auch an unpassenden Stellen und Texten anwenden wollte, nicht dass der Gedanke selbst falsch sei.

Sexualität, die innerhalb der herrschenden Moral einem Tabubruch gleichkommt, einmal unter dem Schutz einer fiktiven Maske aussprechen zu können. Damit wird dieses Liebesgedicht, wie so viele andere des Hochmittelalters, zu einem « contre-text » (nach Pierre Bec) gegen die Catholica²⁸. Gerade die Uneindeutigkeit der Positionen und die schillernden Deutungsmöglichkeiten, welche durch die Trennung von Autor und Persona hervorgerufen werden, machen einen besonderen Reiz dieses Gedichtes aus.

Die unglückliche Ehefrau
(CF 2 *In me dei crudeles nimium*)

Das zweite Gedicht *In me dei crudeles nimium* (CF 2)²⁹ ist ebenfalls nur in den *Carmina Florentina* erhalten. Es nimmt ein Thema auf, das in der volkssprachlichen Lyrik Nordfrankreichs immer beliebt gewesen ist, die Klage der unglücklich verheirateten Frau, des *Chanson de malmariée*³⁰. Zwar gehört das Gedicht zur Gattung des Frauenliedes³¹, doch bedeutet das noch lange nicht, dass es von einer Frau gedichtet wurde, sondern nur, dass die sprechende Persona eine Frau ist. So wie in *Primo quasdam eligo* werden auch hier dem Hörer bzw. Leser zu Beginn des Liedes keinerlei Hinweise auf die Personen oder die Situation gegeben. Genauso wenig findet eine Lenkung durch eine erklärende Überschrift oder Eigennamen statt. Vielmehr muss der Rezipient erst langsam alle Informationen aus der Personenrede erschließen.

²⁸ Vgl. Pierre BEC, *Burlesque et obscénité chez les troubadours. Pour une approche du contre-texte médiéval* (Paris 1984). – Zur Liebesdichtung als literarischem Widerstand gegen die herrschende Moral vgl. Peter DINZELBACHER, *Unglaube im « Zeitalter des Glaubens »*. *Atheismus und Skeptizismus im Mittelalter* (Badenweiler 2009) pp. 81-100.

²⁹ WIC 8991. Editionen: DELBOUILLE (n. 11) p. 176; Peter DRONKE, « Profane Elements in Literature », in: *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, hrsg. Robert L. BENSON / Giles CONSTABLE (Cambridge Mass. 1982) pp. 569-592, hier p. 571 mit engl. Übers.; wieder in: ID., *Sources of Inspiration* (Storia e letteratura 196; Roma 1997) pp. 293-324, hier pp. 295-296; Peter DRONKE, « Riuso di forme e immagini antiche nella poesia », in: *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell'alto Medioevo* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 46; Spoleto 1999) pp. 283-312, hier pp. 308-309; wieder in: ID., *Forms and Imaginings* (Storia e letteratura 243; Roma 2007) pp. 63-85, hier pp. 81-82, n. 48. – Ich zitiere im Folgenden meine eigene Transkription des Florentiner Codex.

³⁰ Vgl. Rudolf DÄHNE, *Die Lieder der Maumariée seit dem Mittelalter* (Halle an der Saale 1933); Pierre BEC, *La lyrique française au moyen âge*, vol. 1 (Paris 1977) pp. 69-90; Susanne FRITSCH-STAA, *Unglückliche Ehefrauen. Zum deutschsprachigen malmariée-Lied* (Berlin 1995), in dem hier pp. 125-133 präsentierten « Text » und der « Interpretation » von CF 2 stört eine Überzahl von Fehlern.

³¹ Vgl. die zweisprachigen Anthologien von Ulrich MÖLK, *Romanische Frauenlieder* (München 1989); Ingrid KASTEN, *Frauenlieder des Mittelalters* (Stuttgart 1990).

Die erste Strophe beschreibt die Seelennot der sprechenden Persona: namenlose und grausame Götter haben ihren ganzen Hass auf sie gerichtet und sie ins Unglück gestürzt:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <i>In me, dei</i> | <i>crudeles nimium,</i> |
| | <i>totum uestrum</i> | <i>uertistis hodium!</i> |
| | <i>Miserorum</i> | <i>hec potest omnium</i> |
| | <i>calamitas</i> | <i>esse solatium!</i> |

Diese beiden Sätze, gleichsam Stoßseufzer, dienen dazu, das Mitgefühl des Hörers für das Unglück der Persona zu erwecken, für ein unabänderliches Schicksal, das nicht von ihr selbst verschuldet ist, sondern von höheren Mächten über sie verhängt wurde. Die Schwere ihres Unglücks übertrifft das anderer Menschen in einer solchen Weise, dass diese an dem Vergleich mit dem ihren noch Trost finden können³².

Damit wird geschickt die Neugier der Hörer geweckt, denn es bleibt Vieles im Unklaren: Spricht hier ein Mann oder eine Frau? Worin besteht das Unglück? Wer sind diese grausamen Götter, wenn das Gedicht, wie wir annehmen dürfen, im christlichen Mittelalter geschrieben wurde? Die ersten Antworten geben uns die Strophen 2 und 3. Wir erfahren, dass die Persona eine junge Frau ist, die von ihren Eltern mit einem reichen und mächtigen, aber ungeliebten Mann, der auch noch an der Lepra erkrankt ist, verheiratet wurde. Sie betont, dass sie auf diese Geldheirat nur eingegangen ist, um die materielle Versorgung ihres noch kindlichen Bruders und ihrer Eltern zu sichern:

- | | | |
|---|----------------------|--------------------------------------------|
| 2 | <i>Successisse</i> | <i>mihi crediderant,</i> |
| | <i>qui me uiro</i> | <i>potenti iunxerant.</i> |
| | <i>Set non ita</i> | <i>dei prouiderant,</i> |
| | <i>qui iam uirum</i> | <i>lepra conspargerant</i> ³³ . |
| 3 | <i>Non accuso</i> | <i>fratris infanciam</i> |
| | <i>sive fictam</i> | <i>parentum gratiam,</i> |
| | <i>set erraui,</i> | <i>concedens ueniam:</i> |
| | <i>dei tantum</i> | <i>causo<r> seuitiam!</i> |

³² Denselben Topos benutzt Abaelard. epist. 1, 1 (PL 178, col. 113 A; MONFRIN [n. 2] p. 63; LUSCOMBE [n. 2] p. 2) ... *de ipsis calamitatum mearum experimentis consolatoriam ad absentem scribere decreui, ut in comparatione mearum tuas aut nullas aut modicas temptationes recognoscas et tolerabilius feras*. – Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) pp. 144-145; TPMA Trost 4; Geselle 6.4.2.2.

³³ So löse ich im Anschluss an Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen, SUB, Cod. W. Meyer VIII 7) und gegen die Editionen die schwierigen Abkürzungen des Florentiner Codex *uir' lap^a 9sperserāt* auf.

Zwar sieht die junge Frau rückblickend ein, wie falsch es war, dem Wunsch der Familie nachzugeben und den Reichen zu heiraten, doch weist sie am Ende der 3. Strophe die eigentliche Schuld an ihrer jetzigen Situation der Grausamkeit eines namenlosen Gottes zu (*dei tantum causo<r>seuitiam*). Hiermit scheint für den Hörer der Höhepunkt des Unglücks erreicht zu sein, denn bisher war alles darauf angelegt, sein Mitleid mit der Persona zu erregen. Gerade angesichts der unheilbaren Krankheit ihres ungeliebten Ehemannes und der Aussichtslosigkeit ihrer Situation müssen ihr die Sympathien aller sicher sein.

Doch nun erfolgt in den beiden letzten Strophen des Gedichts ein unerwarteter Umschwung. Indem die Frau nämlich überlegt, wie sie sich aus dieser Situation befreien könnte, enthüllt sie Zug um Zug ihren wirklichen Charakter. Zunächst beklagt sie, dass aus Furcht vor einer Infektion niemand mehr mit ihr werde schlafen wollen. Denn selbst wenn ihr die Flucht aus dem gutbewachten Haus ihres Mannes tatsächlich gelänge, würde es doch keiner wagen, die Frau eines Leprösen zu berühren:

4	<i>Vt tot claustra</i>	<i>possim euadere,</i>
	<i>et custodes</i>	<i>et uirum fallere,</i>
	<i>quis me demens</i>	<i>dignetur tangere,</i>
	<i>nisi lepram</i>	<i>uelit incurrere?</i>

Der Egoismus und die Rücksichtslosigkeit der Persona offenbaren sich aber vollends in der Schlussstrophe, deren Text man jedoch bis heute fehlerhaft gelesen³⁴ und deren medizinhistorischen Hintergrund man völlig verkannt hat. Die Frau überlegt nämlich, wie sie sich von ihrer eigenen Infektion reinigen könne, indem sie durch den Koitus mit anderen Männern (*per stupra*) die Lepra an diese weitergibt. Aber auch damit kann sie ihrem unglücklichen Schicksal nicht entkommen, denn welcher Mann wird sie nach einer solchen Befleckung (*post tantam labem*) aufnehmen wollen:

5	<i>Quod si tutus</i>	<i>a lepra fuerit,</i>
	<i>me purgatam</i>	<i>per stupra nouerit,</i>
	<i>set amare</i>	<i>quo pacto poterit,</i>
	<i>quam post tantam</i>	<i>labem suscepit?</i>

Dieser auf den ersten Blick befremdliche Gedankengang und der Widerspruch *me purgatam per stupra* finden ihre Erklärung erst, wenn man die naturphilosophischen Schriften der Zeit zu Rate zieht, welche sich mit Problemen der Biologie und Medizin befassen. Am deutlichsten formuliert Wilhelm von Conches die damalige Lehrmeinung in seinem zwischen

³⁴ Meine erneute Kollation des Florentiner Codex ergab, dass gegen alle Editionen in 5, 1 *Quod si* und in 5, 2 *purgatam* zu lesen ist.

1144-1149 Gottfried Plantagenet, dem Herzog der Normandie, gewidmeten *Dragmaticon* (6, 8, 13)³⁵:

Dux: Multas esse causas sterilitatis tam in uiro quam in femina confiteor. Sed adhuc unum est, quod in hoc opere coitus admiror: Quare, si leprosus accedat ad mulierem, mulier non leditur; qui uero primus accedit, leprosus efficitur?

Philosophus: Complexio mulieris frigida est et humida. Dicit autem Ypocras: « Calidissima mulier frigidior est frigidissimo uiro. » Talis uero complexio dura est et corruptioni maxime uirili repugnans. Putrida tamen materia ex coitu leprosi remanet in matrice. Cum autem uir ad eam intrat, uirilis uirga, que ex neruis consistit, matricem intrat, corruptionemque ui attractiua attrahit, atque ad membra, quibus adheret, illam transmittit.

Da also die Krasis der Körpersäfte bei der Frau kalt und feucht ist, stoßen Vagina und Gebärmutter das kontagiöse Sperma (*putrida materia*) des Leprösen ab. Deshalb erkrankt die Frau nicht selbst, sondern bewahrt den kontagiösen Stoff nur auf, um ihn vollständig an den nächsten Partner weiterzugeben, der sich dann indirekt mit der Lepra infiziert. Damit besteht für die Persona in unserem Gedicht durchaus eine Möglichkeit, sich von der Ansteckung durch ihren Ehemann zu befreien, nämlich indem sie den kontagiösen Stoff durch den Koitus an einen Gesunden weitergibt³⁶.

Hier setzt nun aber das eigentliche Dilemma der Frau ein. Verzichtet sie auf den Koitus mit anderen Partnern, so bleibt sie ansteckend und wird wegen der Angst vor der Lepra keinen neuen Liebhaber finden. Reinigt sie sich aber durch Promiskuität, dann muss sie befürchten, dass sich auch aus diesem Grund niemand mehr mit ihr wird einlassen wollen. Jeder Weg zu einem passenden Partner ist ihr also durch die Heirat mit dem Leprösen versperrt. In dieser Ausweglosigkeit liegt ihr ganzes Unglück.

Am Ende des Gedichts sind zwar die eingangs gestellten Fragen nach der Situation beantwortet und unsere Neugier ist befriedigt, doch hat sich viel-

³⁵ Italo RONCA (Hrsg.), *Guillelmi de Conchis Dragmaticon philosophiae* (CC CM 152; Turnhout 1997) p. 211.

³⁶ Vgl. Danielle JACQUART / Claude THOMASSET, *Sexualité et savoir médical au Moyen Age* (Paris 1985) pp. 257-261. – Mit derselben Übertragungsmöglichkeit der Lepra rechnen auch die folgenden Anekdoten aus einer *Vita auctoris* (Müldener Vita IV) zur *Alexandreis* Walters von Châtillon (Marvin L. COLKER [Hrsg.], *Galteri de Castellione Alexandreis* [Thesaurus Mundi 17; Padua 1978] p. XVII, aus Erfurt, Cod. Amplon. 8° 90):

Kanonikus Remensis fuit et habuit concubinam, que compulsa fiebat a milite, quod admitteret leprosum et immediate Galthierum. Hoc factum est, et ita factus est leprosus.

Accidit etiam Parisius, ut magister bonus naturalis haberet iuuenem comitem discipulum spaciantem cum eo circa uineta, quod [qui Müldener] accederet ad talem mulierem. Cum redisset, dixit: « Tu infectus es per lepram. Veni subito, coi cum ea! Tunc sanus eris, quia resumes a te, quod suscepas. »

leicht bei manchen Hörern im Verlauf des Textes die Einstellung zu der sprechenden Persona verändert. Konnte sich die junge Frau, die nur aus Rücksicht auf die Heiratspläne ihrer Familie einen ungeliebten und dazu noch leprösen Mann geheiratet hatte, am Ende der 3. Strophe unserer Sympathie für ihr Schicksal noch sicher sein, so verliert sie diese wieder, indem sie am Schluss ihr skrupelloses Kalkül bloßstellt. Ihre egoistischen und rücksichtslosen Überlegungen, wie sie die Krankheit an einen ahnungslosen Dritten weitergeben könne, um einen neuen Liebhaber zu finden, werden vielleicht manche Leser sogar abstoßend finden. Sie « enttäuscht » uns im wahrsten Sinne des Wortes, indem sie – wenn auch unwillentlich – ihre geheimsten Gedanken dem Publikum preisgibt. Es bleibt jedoch dem Hörer oder Leser anheim gestellt, ob er ihr Verhalten moralisch missbilligen, oder ob er über die Inkongruenz zwischen dem hohen Pathos des Anfangs und dem kaltblütigen Kalkül des Schlusses lachen wird.

Der keusche Liebhaber

(CF 7 / CB 88 *Amor habet superos*)

Das dritte Gedicht *Amor habet superos*³⁷ wird gleichzeitig in den *Carmina Florentina* (CF 7) und in den berühmten *Carmina Burana* (CB 88) überliefert und stellt somit das Verbindungsglied zwischen beiden Sammlungen her. Deshalb dürfen wir auch vermuten, dass in den *Carmina Burana* noch weitere Lieder aus dem Kreis Abaelards erhalten sein könnten. Da die Texte der beiden Handschriften aber in der Strophenfolge und zahlreichen Lesarten voneinander abweichen, ist der Interpret gezwungen, sich für eine Version zu entscheiden. Ich werde mich im Folgenden nur auf die Textfassung des Florentiner Codex beziehen, welche eine inhaltlich und gedanklich sinnvolle Abfolge bietet, während das Gedicht in den *Carmina Burana* nachträglich mit einem anderen Gedicht (CB 88a *Ioue cum Mercurio Geminos tenente*) kombiniert und überarbeitet wurde³⁸.

Das Gedicht setzt mit einer umfangreichen Ovidimitation ein: Amor, der Gott der Liebe, beherrscht sogar die olympischen Götter; selbst Jupi-

³⁷ WIC 924 (*Amor habet superos*); WIC 10456 (*Ludo cum Cecilia*). Editionen: Die authentische Strophenfolge von F ist nur bei MEYER (n. 6) pp. 161-166 und Günter BERNT, *Carmina Burana. Lateinisch / Deutsch* (Stuttgart 1992) pp. 142-147, Kom. p. 318, bewahrt. – Unterschiedliche Rekonstruktionen bieten: Otto SCHUMANN (Hrsg.), *Carmina Burana*, I. 2. *Die Liebeslieder* (Heidelberg 1941) pp. 78-80; Benedikt Konrad VOLLMANN (Hrsg.), *Carmina Burana* (Frankfurt am Main 1987) pp. 300-305, Kom. pp. 1054-1057; Patrick Gerard WALSH, *Love Lyrics from the Carmina Burana* (Chapel Hill / London 1993) pp. 94-97, mit engl. Übers.

³⁸ Vgl. MEYER (n. 6) pp. 165; SCHUMANN, *Die Liebeslieder* (n. 37) pp. 81-82; VOLLMANN, *Carmina Burana* (n. 37) p. 1055.

ter, Neptun und Pluto müssen ihm gehorchen. Diesen Gedanken hatte schon Ovid in seinen *Metamorphosen* (5, 366-379) ausgeführt, als Venus ihrem Sohn Cupido den Auftrag gibt, Pluto mit seinen Geschossen zu verwunden, so dass er, kaum dass er die schöne Proserpina zum ersten Mal erblickt, sogleich in Liebe zu ihr entbrennt³⁹. Auf diesen Passus bezieht sich der Dichter zu Beginn mit einem funktionellen Zitat:

1	<A>mor habet superos:	<i>Iouem amat Iuno.</i>
	<i>Motu<s> premens efferos,</i>	<i>imperat Neptuno.</i>
	<i>Pluto tenens inferos,</i>	<i>mitis est hoc uno.</i>

Diese Feststellung wird in der 2. Strophe von der Sphäre der Götter auf das Leben der Menschen ausgeweitet: auch hier regiert die Allmacht Amors, der die Sanften antreibt und die Widerspenstigen bezwingt. Diese werden mit dem wilden und gefährlichen Einhorn verglichen, das nach der Lehre des *Physiologus* nur von einer Jungfrau besänftigt und in ihrem Schoß festgehalten werden kann, damit es die Jäger überwältigen und fangen⁴⁰:

2	<i>Amor trahit teneros</i>	<i>molliori nexu:</i>
	<i>rigidos et asperos</i>	<i>miro frangit flexu.</i>
	<i>Capitur rinosceros</i>	<i>uirginis amplexu.</i>

Die beiden ersten Strophen allein verraten uns zwar schon, dass wir ein Liebesgedicht vor uns haben, lassen aber im Unklaren, welche Personen hier auftreten und wer das Lied vorträgt. Das erfahren wir sozusagen nur

³⁹ Besonders Ov. met. 5, 369-372 (Venus an Cupido):

*Tu superos ipsumque Iouem, tu numina ponti
Victa domas ipsumque, regit qui numina ponti.
Tartara quid cessant? Cur non matrisque tuumque
Imperium proferes? ...*

Zu diesem Topos vgl. Rudolf Wilhelm LENZEN, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche und Verfasseruntersuchungen zur lateinischen Liebesdichtung Frankreichs im Hochmittelalter* (Diss. Bonn 1973) pp. 33-35; weitere Stellen bei WOLLIN, *Petri Blesensis Carmina* (n. 23) p. 392 (zu Petr. Bles. carm. 3, 1, 4).

⁴⁰ *Physiologus Latinus B*, cap. 16 Unicornis, 1-6 (Francis J. CARMODY [Hrsg.], *Physiologus Latinus. Éditions préliminaires, versio B* [Paris 1939] p. 31): *Est animal, quod Graece dicitur monosceros, Latine uero unicornis. Physiologus dicit unicornem hanc habere naturam: pusillum animal est, simile haedo, acerrimum nimis, unum cornu habens in medio capite. Et nullus omnino uenator eum capere potest; sed hoc argumento eum capiunt: puellam uirginem ducunt in illum locum, ubi moratur, et dimittunt eam in siluam solam; at ille uero, mox ut uiderit eam, salit in sinum uirginis, et complectitur eam, et sic comprehenditur, et exhibetur in palatio regis.* – Vgl. Florence McCULLOCH, *Mediaeval Latin and French Bestiaries* (Chapel Hill NC ²1962) pp. 179-183; Nikolaus HENKEL, *Studien zum Physiologus im Mittelalter* (Hermæa NF 38; Tübingen 1976) pp. 168-171; Jürgen W. EINHORN, «Einhorn», in: *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 3 (1981) col. 1246-1256. – In der zeitgenössischen Dichtung begegnet der Gedanke z. B. in CB 93a, 3-4; Antidotum magistri Guilelmi 56.

zwischendurch im Refrain, der nach der ersten Strophe einsetzt und nach jeder weiteren wiederholt wird. Hier behauptet eine männliche Persona, mit der jungfräulichen Geliebten nur jungfräulich umgehen und ohne Samen pflügen zu wollen. Das sind elegante Periphrasen des zentralen Themas: dass die Jungfräulichkeit der Geliebten bewahrt werden müsse:

R <i>Amoris solamine</i>	<i>uirgino cum uirgine.</i>
<i>Aro non in semine,</i>	<i>pecco sine crimine.</i>

Welcher Zusammenhang jedoch zwischen den beiden Anfangsstrophen und dem Refrain besteht, bleibt bis zur 3. Strophe ungewiss. Jetzt erst erfahren wir, dass es die Persona des Refrains ist, die auch das Gedicht vorträgt, denn sie erklärt, dass Amor, der die Olympier und Menschen regiert, auch sie beherrsche und das Liebesfeuer in ihr entzündet habe:

3 <i>Virginis egregie</i>	<i>ignibus calesco,</i>
<i>et eius cotidie</i>	<i>in amorem cresco.</i>
<i>Sol est in meridie,</i>	<i>nec ego tepesco.</i>

Obgleich die Persona in der 4. Strophe das Liebesspiel und die Küsse der Geliebten als süßer als Honig preist, verwahrt sie sich sogleich in der 5. Strophe, der Mitte des Gedichts, gegen die Unterstellung, dass es mit der geliebten Cecilia zum Koitus käme. Vielmehr beteuert sie abermals die Aussage des Refrains, nur die Hüterin (*custodia*) ihrer Jungfräulichkeit sein zu wollen:

4 <i>Gratus super omnia</i>	<i>ludus est puelle,</i>
<i>et eius precordia</i>	<i>carent omni felle.</i>
<i>Sunt, que prestat, basia</i>	<i>du<l>ciora melle.</i>
5 <i>Ludo cum Cecilia:</i>	<i>nichil timeatis!</i>
<i>Sum quasi custodia</i>	<i>fragilis etatis,</i>
<i>ne marcescant lilia</i>	<i>sue castitatis.</i>

Bemerkenswert ist der folgerichtig aufgebaute Gedankengang der ersten Gedichthälfte, der entfernt an einen logischen Syllogismus erinnert. Am Beginn steht ein Prouerbium generale, die allgemeine Feststellung, dass die Liebe sogar die Olympier beherrscht (*Amor habet superos*). Die Gültigkeit dieser Aussage wird in der 2. Strophe auf die Menschenwelt ausgedehnt, in der Amor die Willigen führt und die Unwilligen zwingt. Den Übergang zu einer partikulären Aussage, dass nämlich auch die Persona verliebt ist, bietet die 3. Strophe, der sich der Preis des Liebesspiels mit der Geliebten in der 4. Strophe anschließt. An der Stelle aber, wo nun der Hörer die Fortsetzung des Liebesspiels im Koitus erwartet, durchbricht die Persona die aufgebaute Erwartung, indem sie sich gerade gegen eine solche Vermutung verwahrt.

Die nächsten drei Strophen (6-8) dienen der Persona nur zur Bestätigung ihrer keuschen Absichten, die sie in immer wieder neuen Bildern, Vergleichen und Überlegungen variiert: Blumen soll man nicht brechen, Trauben muss man reifen lassen, nur Jungfrauen eignen sich zur Liebe, nicht aber verkommene Prostituierte⁴¹, auch wenn alle anderen anders denken und handeln, so wolle er doch seinem Vorhaben treu bleiben:

6	<i>Flos est: florem frangere</i>	<i>non est res segura.</i>
	<i>Vuam sino crescere,</i>	<i>donec sit matura.</i>
	<i>Spes me facit uiuere</i>	<i>letum re uentura.</i>

7	<i>Ludo cum uirginibus,</i>	<i><h>orreo corruptas,</i>
	<i>et cum meretricibus</i>	<i>semper odi nuptas;</i>
	<i>nam in istis talibus</i>	<i>turpis est uoluptas.</i>

8	<i>Quicquid agant alii,</i>	<i>uirgo, sic agamus,</i>
	<i>ut, quem decet fieri,</i>	<i>ludum faciamus!</i>
	<i>Ambo sumus teneri:</i>	<i>tenere ludamus!</i>

In der Peroratio bemüht die Persona die Lehre von den *Quinque lineae amoris*, in welchen man seit der Antike die Abfolge der Liebesbeziehung festgelegt hatte: Blick, Gespräch, Berührung, Kuss und Koitus (*uisus, colloquium, tactus, osculum, factum*)⁴². Die ersten vier Stufen, das heißt bis zum Kuss, hält die Persona für erlaubt, die fünfte jedoch, das *agere*, versagt sie sich selbst. Die Mahnung an den ungläubigen Zuhörer *fuge suspicari*, also keine böswilligen Unterstellungen zu hegen, zitiert die sprechende Persona aus der Ode 2, 4 des Horaz⁴³:

⁴¹ Vgl. Abaelard. epist. 1, 15 (PL 178, col. 126 C; MONFRIN [n. 2] p. 71; LUSCOMBE [n. 2] p. 24) *Quia igitur scortorum immunditiam semper abhorrebam, et ab accessu et frequentatione nobilium feminarum studii scholaris assiduitate reuocabar, nec laicarum conuersationem multum noueram, praua michi, ut dicitur, Fortuna blandiens commodiorem nacta est occasionem, qua me facilius de sublimitatis huius fastigio prostermeret ...* – Vgl. WOLLIN (n. 10) p. 146.

⁴² Vgl. Karl HELM, «Quinque lineae amoris», *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* 29 (1941) pp. 236-247; Ernst Robert CURTIUS, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Tübingen ¹¹1993) pp. 500-502; Lionel J. FRIEDMAN, «Gradus amoris», *Romance Philology* 19 (1965) pp. 167-177; F. P. R. AKEHURST, «Les étapes de l'amour», *Cahiers de Civilisation Médiévale* 16 (1973) pp. 133-147; Rüdiger SCHNELL, *Causa Amoris. Liebeskonzeption und Liebesdarstellung in der mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Bibliotheca Germanica 27; Bern / München 1985) pp. 26-28, und 246; weitere Angaben bei WOLLIN, *Petri Blesensis Carmina* (n. 23) p. 450 (zu Petr. Bles. carm. 3, 10, 2a, 1-7) und TPMA Coitus 1.

⁴³ Hor. carm. 2, 4, 21-24:

*Brachia et uoltum teretesque suras
integer laudo – fuge suspicari –
cuius octauum trepidauit aetas
claudere lustrum.*

9 *Volo tantum ludere, id est contemplari,*
presens loqui, tangere, tandem osculari;
quintum, quod est agere, fuge suspicari!

Wir sehen, wie kunstvoll das Gedicht von den zwei funktionalen Zitaten aus den antiken Dichtern eingerahmt wird⁴⁴: der Anfang evoziert die *Metamorphosen* Ovids, der Schlussvers zitiert eine Ode des Horaz. Die inhaltliche Spannung zwischen der sexuellen Begierde Plutos bei Ovid und der eleganten Verwahrung bei Horaz entspricht derjenigen in unserem Gedicht. Vor allem drängt sich der Zweifel auf, ob angesichts der so eindringlich geschilderten Allmacht Amors das *fuge suspicari* überhaupt ernst gemeint sein kann⁴⁵, denn mit der horazischen Ode hat unser Gedicht vielleicht mehr als das Zitat gemeinsam. Auch bei Horaz spricht eine schon ältere männliche Persona, die versucht, den Adressaten Xanthias und die Zuhörer davon zu überzeugen, dass sie nur untadelige Absichten verfolge, wenn sie des Xanthias schöne Sklavin Phyllis bewundernd anschau und ihre Schönheit preise. In beiden Gedichten lässt die ostentative Leugnung das Gegenteil vermuten.

Wie bei Horaz, so stellt sich auch in *Amor habet superos* die Frage, ob wir naiv den Beteuerungen der Persona Glauben schenken dürfen, oder ob wir in ihnen eher die Ironie des Dichters erkennen sollen. Für die Ironie spricht die gesamte sprachliche Gestaltung unseres Gedichts, in welchem ein Ironiesignal dem anderen folgt. Schon das erste Hören des Refrains muss den Hörer an der Aufrichtigkeit zweifeln lassen, denn der witzige Neologismus *uirginare*⁴⁶ und das Wortspiel *uirgino cum uirgine*, welche in

Auch bei den Zeitgenossen Abaelards zitiert: Hilar. Aurel. carm. 1, 25, 3-4:

Fuge, frater, suspicari, nec sit hic suspicio,
Non in mundo, sed in Christo fuit hec dilectio.

Hugo Primas carm. 16, 95:

Fuge suspicari par mal intencium!

⁴⁴ Zur Verwendung der antiken Dichter bei Abaelard vgl. David LUSCOMBE, « Peter Abelard and the Poets », in: *Poetry and Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (Fs. Peter Dronke) (Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 29; Leiden 2001) pp. 155-171, hier pp. 165-166 zu Horaz, pp. 166-168 zu Ovid.

⁴⁵ Ich kann mich nicht einer Interpretation anschließen, die in den Keuschheitsschwüren der Persona eine Freiheit von der Allmacht Amors zu erkennen glaubt, so Winthrop WETHERBEE, « The Place of Secular Latin Lyric », in: William D. PADEN (Hrsg.), *Medieval Lyric, Genres in Historical Context* (Urbana / Chicago 2000) pp. 95-125, hier p. 106: « As a frame for this rather unappealing posture, the poet posits a state of nature in which love collaborates with cosmic order, causing Jove and the other gods to keep to their proper spheres, and a world where virginity possesses a talismanic power which keeps lust and its disruptive power at bay. »

⁴⁶ Das spätantike Deponens *uirginari* (einziger Beleg Tert. uirg. uel. 12) war dem Dichter sicherlich unbekannt; vgl. Karl Ernst GEORGES, *Ausführliches lateinisch-deutsches Handwör-*

der Übersetzung kaum nachgeahmt werden können, werden ihn eher zum Schmunzeln oder Lachen als zum Vertrauen bewegen. Wie schwierig es für die Persona ist, allein schon in Gedanken der Attraktivität der Cecilia zu widerstehen, zeigt sich darin, dass, wenn sie in Str. 4 die Küsse der Cecilia als « süßer als Honig » preist, sie in Str. 5 sogleich eine übertriebene Beteuerung ihrer keuschen Absichten folgen lässt. Man darf wohl eher vermuten, dass die Persona mit Hilfe ihrer zahlreichen Betonungen der Keuschheit versucht, sich selbst zu überzeugen, indem sie ihr wirkliches Verlangen mit einem rationalistischen Mäntelchen verkleidet, ohne es aber verdecken zu können. Auch das abschließende Horazzitat vermag nicht, der Persona eine größere Glaubwürdigkeit zu verschaffen, eher im Gegenteil.

Eine solche Zurückhaltung des Liebhabers empfanden selbst die Zeitgenossen des Dichters als unwahrscheinlich und unglaublich⁴⁷. Häufiger schon hat man unser Gedicht in Zusammenhang gebracht mit der berühmten Beschreibung des Amor purus und Amor mixtus im Liebestraktat *De amore* des Andreas Capellanus, wo im 1. Buch, im Dialog *Loquitur nobilior nobiliori*, der Mann um die Frau wirbt, indem er vorgibt, ihr etwas Neues und nur wenigen Bekanntes zu eröffnen. Daraufhin führt er die Lehre vom Amor purus aus, der zwar alle Liebesfreuden auskostet, aber auf die letzte Stufe, den Koitus, verzichtet (*extremo pretermisso solatio*), im Gegensatz zum allbekannten Amor mixtus, der den Koitus einschließt. Der Amor purus sei besonders für den Amor uirginum geeignet, da er die Jungfräulichkeit und den guten Ruf der Geliebten bewahre. Aus dieser völlig singulären Stelle hatte die ältere Forschung eine der grundlegenden Dok-

terbuch (Hannover ³1913/18) vol. 2, col. 3508; DU CANGE (Niort ³1887) vol. 8, p. 349, s. v. virginare, kennt noch zwei weitere Belege (Lamb. Ard.; Hugutio)⁸. Erstaunlich ist es aber, dass der Zeitgenosse Hugutio von Pisa das aktive Verb in exakt derselben Bedeutung wie in CF 7, nämlich als Beschreibung des Amor purus, erklärt; vgl. Enzo CECCHINI e. a. (Hrsg.), *Uguccione da Pisa, Derivationes* (Firenze 2004) vol. 2, p. 1284, Deriu. U 32, 28: *Et « uirgino -as », caste uiuere, in uirginitate degere, more uirginis se habere; item uirginare est fricare et facere huiusmodi, que possunt fieri salua uirginitate ...* – Kannte auch Hugutio das Lied *Amor habet superos*?

⁴⁷ Der Gedanke wird seit der Antike häufig als Sprichwort formuliert; vgl. Ov. ars 1, 669-670 (WPS 20453; TPMA Kuss 5 und 6):

Oscula qui sumpsit, si non et cetera sumit,

Haec quoque, quae data sunt, perdere dignus erit.

Johann Jakob WERNER, *Lateinische Sprichwörter und Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters* (Darmstadt ²1966) Nr. o 97 (WPS 20452; TPMA Kuss 5; Liebe 4.6.5):

Oscula que prebet, post culum reddere debet:

Diligit et ramos, qui plantam diligit ipsam.

Guillaume de Lorris, *Le Roman de la rose* 3403:

Mais bien croi qu'au baisier puet ataindre

A peine puet atant remaindre.

trinen der «Höfischen Liebe» herauslesen wollen⁴⁸, wobei es sich doch nur um das geschickte Zurechtlegen von Argumenten von Seiten einer Person innerhalb des Dialoges handelt, um die geliebte Frau zu gewinnen. Ich zitiere die wichtigsten Ausführungen des Mannes⁴⁹:

Ego quoddam aliud uobis cupio reserare, quod mente gero, quod multorum scio corda latere, uos tamen ignorare non credo, quod amor quidam est purus, et quidam dicitur esse mixtus. Et purus quidem amor est, qui omnimoda dilectionis affectione duorum amantium corda coniungit. Hic autem in mentis contemplatione cordisque consistit affectu; procedit autem usque ad oris osculum lacertique amplexum et uerecundum amantis nude contactum, extremo pretermisso solatio; nam illud pure amare uolentibus exercere non licet. ... Ex tali nempe amore neque uirgo † nunquam corrupta, nec uidua uel coniugata potest aliquod sentire grauamen uel proprie fame dispendium sustinere. Hunc ergo colo amorem, hunc sequor et semper adoro et instanter uobis postulare non cesso.

Dem entgegnet die Frau, sie wolle den Amor purus gerne loben, doch könne sie nicht glauben, dass jemand in der Lage sei, mit einer solchen Selbstbeherrschung seinem Trieb Widerstand zu leisten⁵⁰:

Inaudita et incognita uerba profertis, et que uix ab aliquo credibilia iudicantur. Miror enim, si in quoquam tanta sit abstinentia carnis inuenta, ut unquam uoluptatis promeruerit impetum refrenare et corporis motibus obuiare. Monstruosum namque iudicatur a cunctis, si quis in igne positus non uratur. Si quis tamen in hac fide, quam dicitis, fuerit amoris puritate repertus et in prefata, quam dixistis, continentia carnis, huius laudo et plenius confirmo propositum et ipsum censeo omni honore dignissimum, mixtum tamen amorem nullo modo damnare contendens, quo mundus fere fruitur uniuersus.

Vergleicht man unser Lied *Amor habet superos* mit den Zitaten aus dem Traktat des Andreas Capellanus, dann wird deutlich, dass im Lied einerseits die sprechende Persona den Amor purus als Mittel des Amor uirginum preist, doch andererseits die Ironisierung und Distanzierung von Seiten des

⁴⁸ Die ältere Position vertritt, stellvertretend für viele: Alexander J. DENOMY, «Fin' Amors: The Pure Love of the Troubadours, its Amorality, and Possible Source», *Mediaeval Studies* 7 (1945) pp. 139-207. – Einen Überblick über die Forschung und neuere Interpretationen vermitteln: Roger BOASE, *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love* (Manchester 1977); Ursula LIEBERTZ-GRÜN, *Zur Soziologie des amour courtois. Umrisse der Forschung* (Beihefte zum Euphorion 10; Heidelberg 1977); Franz TAIANA, *Amor purus und die Minne* (Freiburg / Schweiz 1977); Rüdiger SCHNELL, *Andreas Capellanus. Zur Rezeption des römischen und kanonischen Rechts in De amore* (Münstersche Mittelalter-Schriften 46; München 1982) pp. 118-126.

⁴⁹ Ernst TROJEL (Hrsg.), *Andreae Capellani regii Francorum De Amore libri tres* (Kopenhagen 1892; Reprint München 1964) pp. 182-183.

⁵⁰ TROJEL (n. 49) p. 184.

empirischen Autors diese voller Inbrunst vorgetragenen Beteuerungen als Mittel der Überredung und des Selbstbetrugs entlarven. Die Persona vertritt also die Position des Mannes bei Andreas, der geschickt die Rezeption lenkende Autor die Skepsis der Frau. Die ironische Distanz zwischen dem empirischen Autor und der Persona macht es unmöglich, das Lied *Amor habet superos* als Zeugnis für die «Höfische Liebe» zu beanspruchen. Wenn die oben vorgeschlagene Datierung ca. 1100-1140 zutrifft, dann ist CF 7 ungefähr zur Zeit der zweiten Generation der Trobadors entstanden und kann nicht einmal als Parodie auf den *Fin' amors* aufgefasst werden.

Schon vor einigen Jahren hat Peter Godman die ansprechende Vermutung vertreten, dass *Amor habet superos* einen späteren Dichter zu einer ausgelassenen Parodie herausgefordert haben könnte⁵¹. Die Sequenz *Ex ungue primo teneram* (Petr. Bles. carm. 5, 4)⁵² wird in einer kleinen Liedersammlung überliefert, welche Rudolf Wilhelm Lenzen als «Sammlung X» bezeichnete und Peter Dronke dem berühmten Briefschriftsteller und Archidiakon von Bath Peter von Blois (ca. 1130/35-1211/12) zuschrieb⁵³. Die Überlieferung und die literarischen Anspielungen legen zwar eine Entstehung dieser Lieder im Schülerkreis des Bernardus Silvestris in Tours um 1150 nahe, doch lässt sich die Autorschaft Peters, der gleichfalls dort studiert hatte, nicht mit Sicherheit nachweisen⁵⁴. Die frühe Datierung von *Amor habet superos* vor der «Sammlung X» verleiht Godmans Vermutung eine gewisse Plausibilität.

Das Lied *Ex ungue* ist ebenfalls ein Persona-Gedicht, in welchem ein Mann spricht, der lange Zeit seiner jungen Freundin gegenüber dieselben «keuschen» Absichten gehegt hatte wie die Persona in CF 7:

*Ex ungue primo teneram
nutrieram,
ut te, Lice,
prima uice
etatem circa puberem
exigerem,
et carperem
primitias
pudoris.*

(Petr. Bles. carm. 5, 4, 1a)

⁵¹ Peter GODMAN, «Literary Classicism and Latin Erotic Poetry of the Twelfth Century and the Renaissance», in: *Latin Poetry and the Classical Tradition*, hrsg. Peter GODMAN / Oswyn MURRAY (Oxford 1990) pp. 149-182, hier p. 166.

⁵² WIC 6022 (*Ex ungue*), 121 (*Ab ungue*). Neuedition bei WOLLIN, *Petri Blesensis Carmina* (n. 23) pp. 607-610.

⁵³ LENZEN (n. 39) pp. 68-97; Peter DRONKE, «Peter of Blois and Poetry at the Court of Henry II», in: ID., *The Medieval Poet and his World* (Storia e letteratura 164; Roma 1984) pp. 281-339, hier p. 322 und 335-336.

⁵⁴ WOLLIN, *Petri Blesensis Carmina* (n. 23) pp. 124-132.

Doch während er noch glaubte, die Jungfräulichkeit seiner Lice (Lyce nach Horaz *carm.* 3, 10; 4, 13) für sich selbst aufsparen zu können, hat ihn das frühreife Mädchen hintergangen und sich anderen Männern hingegeben:

*Fouisti uiros gremio
pro pretio,
iam iam uiuis
cum lasciuis;
septennis adhuc fueras ...*

(Petr. Bles. *carm.* 5, 4, 1b, 1-5)

Dabei hat sie, die er schonen wollte, weil er sie für den Koitus zu zart hielt, schon weit größere «Spieße» empfangen (2b, 1-3 *Audax uirguncula / maiora multo iacula / suscipere decreuit*). So sieht sich die Persona am Ende in all ihren Absichten von Lice betrogen:

*Te futuram
iam maturam
dum studio
custodio,
corpus adhuc impube, tenerum
furtim uendis, migrans ad alterum -
et doleo!*

(Petr. Bles. *carm.* 5, 4, 3b)

Es ist faszinierend zu sehen, wie der Dichter von *Ex ungue*, obgleich er mit keinem einzigen Zitat auf das Vorbild hinweist, trotzdem in beinahe jedem Gedanken und jedem Detail auf dem Gedicht *Amor habet superos* aufbaut und es weiterführt. Die vermeintliche Keuschheit des Liebhabers in CF 7 wird hier nachträglich als Lüge enttarnt, sein hinter sinniges Abwarten durch die Eskapaden der frühreifen Lice zunichte gemacht. Das junge Alter der Geliebten wird mutwillig übertrieben durch den Hinweis, sie sei *septennis*, wohingegen selbst das Mittelalter die Heiratsfähigkeit der Frau erst mit 12-14 Jahren veranschlagte. Auch mit ihrer Keuschheit ist es nicht weit her, da sie selbst auf Männerfang auszieht, um sich dabei den *maiora multo iacula* hinzugeben. Diese teilweise grotesken Übertreibungen bekommen, wie ich meine, ihren eigentlichen Sinn erst dann, wenn man sie als parodistische Antwort auf *Amor habet superos* auffasst.

Ich möchte noch einen raschen Blick auf die übrigen Zeugnisse für die Rezeption von *Amor habet superos* werfen, die bei weitem reicher ist, als es die schmale Überlieferung in nur zwei Handschriften ahnen lässt. Sie erinnert nämlich an die zu Beginn zitierten Bemerkungen, dass Abaelards Lieder in der Provinz und sogar von den Laien gesungen wurden. So scheint noch am Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts ein anonymen Schriftsteller die beiden Schlussverse von CF 7 inklusive des auffälligen Horazzitates (Str. 9,

2-3) in einem Kommentar zum ersten Buch des Martianus Capella zu zitieren⁵⁵. Fragmente des Gedichts wurden bei archäologischen Grabungen im mittelalterlichen Hafen von Bergen in Norwegen gefunden. Ein norwegischer Kleriker hatte das Liebeslied (zusammen mit Versen aus CB 73) in Runenschrift auf einem Holzstab eingeritzt, um den schönen Text jederzeit zur Hand zu haben, wenn er ihn lesen oder singen wollte⁵⁶. Ein interessantes Beispiel dafür, wie weit sich die Beliebtheit der mittellateinischen Lyrik erstreckte, wenn sogar die Nachfahren der Wikinger sie lasen.

Weit rätselhafter ist der Eintrag des Refrains als Federprobe auf der letzten Seite einer Lucan-Handschrift (Paris, BnF, Ms. lat. 17901, fol. 93r, vermutlich Ende des 12. Jahrhunderts). Neben einem mit der Feder gezeichneten Frauenkopf stehen vier Verse, von denen nur die ersten beiden mit unserem Gedicht übereinstimmen, während der Text danach mit einem merkwürdigen Gemisch von lateinischen und französischen (?) Wörtern fortfährt⁵⁷:

*amoris solamine .
uirgino con uirgine .
amor nouela gaudeat .
omnis omo ama pucella*

Wie es aber nun zu dieser zweisprachigen Strophe gekommen ist, bleibt unklar. Berücksichtigt man die nur im Lateinischen sinnvolle Figura etymologica *uirgino cum uirgine* und den vermutlich vom Dichter ad hoc geschaffenen Neologismus *uirginare*, dann kann nur der lateinische Refrain in *Amor habet superos* ursprünglich sein. Dieser müsste allerdings so beliebt und vielgesungen gewesen sein, dass die Menschen sich des Anfangs entsannen und diesen dann frei improvisierend in ihrer Muttersprache fortsetzten. Genau auf diese Weise werden wohl auch die Gedichte Abaelards auf den Straßen und Plätzen « zersungen » worden sein. Aber so attraktiv

⁵⁵ Haijo Jan WESTRA (Hrsg.), *The Berlin Commentary on Martianus Capella's De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book I* (Mittellateinische Studien und Texte 20; Leiden 1994) p. 329:

Quodam modo exponit, quibus floribus intextum esset eius sertum, in quo notat quinque illa, que in amore sunt necessaria:

Visus et alloquium, tactus, post oscula, factum. [WIC 20651; WPS 33819]
Prius enim uidemus, quam concupiscimus; deinde alloquimur; de alloquio uenitur ad tactum; quartum est osculari; quintum est agere: fuge suspicari! [Hor. carm. 2, 4, 22]

⁵⁶ Vgl. Aslak LIESTÖL, « Runeninschriften von der Bryggen in Bergen (Norwegen) », *Zeitschrift für Archäologie des Mittelalters* 1 (1973) pp. 129-139, hier pp. 131-132; Klaus DÜWEL, *Runenkunde* (Sammlung Metzler 72; Stuttgart 2008) p. 167 mit weiterer Literatur.

⁵⁷ Bernhard BISCHOFF (Hrsg.), *Carmina Burana*, I. 3. *Die Trinker- und Spielerlieder – Die geistlichen Dramen* (Heidelberg 1970) p. 203; MUNK OLSEN (n. 11) vol. 2, p. 61. Ich zitiere nach einem Photo der Handschrift.

es auch sein mag, *Amor habet superos* Abaelard zuzuschreiben, so fehlt uns dazu doch im Moment jeder schlüssige philologische Beweis.

Der Untreue

(CB 117 *Lingua mendax et dolosa*)

Aus den *Carmina Burana* stammt das Lied *Lingua mendax et dolosa* (CB 117)⁵⁸, welches die rhythmische Form und das Motiv der Verwünschung der lügnerschen Zunge mit dem Gedicht *Lingua serui, lingua perfidie* (carm. 6) des Hilarius von Orléans gemeinsam hat. Aber es weist auch eindeutige Zitatbeziehungen zu anderen Gedichten des 12. und 13. Jahrhunderts auf, so dass Walther Lipphardt das Gedicht dem « Kreis des Hilarius » zugerechnet hat. Dieter Schaller vermutete aufgrund der reichen Rezeptionszeugnisse sogar, dass wir mit CB 117 eines der verlorenen Liebesgedichte Abaelards in Händen halten könnten⁵⁹. Da schon drei unterschiedliche Interpretationen vorliegen⁶⁰, welche die wesentlichen Aspekte des Verwahrungsgedichts, der Berufung auf unpassende Auctoritates und der durchgängigen Hyperbolik und Ironie herausgearbeitet haben, kann ich mich im Folgenden kurz fassen und mich auf die Frage nach der Selbstdarstellung der sprechenden Persona beschränken.

Das Lied beginnt, wiederum ohne Überschrift oder Einleitung, unmittelbar mit dem Zornesausbruch der Persona, welche die lügnersche Zunge des Verleumders verwünscht (Str. 1-2). Diese ist nicht nur verschlagen und voller Gift, sondern verdiente abgeschnitten und zur Strafe im Feuer verbrannt zu werden⁶¹. Verschiedene rhetorische Figuren der Wiederho-

⁵⁸ WIC 10337. Editionen: SCHUMANN, *Die Liebeslieder* (n. 37) pp. 192-193; VOLLMANN, *Carmina Burana* (n. 37) pp. 424-429 mit dt. Übers., Kom. pp. 1102-1103; WALSH, *Love Lyrics* (n. 37) pp. 146-148 mit engl. Übers.; BULST (n. 14) pp. 60-61; BERNT (n. 37) pp. 170-173, Kom. p. 323.

⁵⁹ SPANKE (n. 7) col. 42; LIPPARDT (n. 7) pp. 131-132; SCHALLER (n. 8) pp. 10-11. – So gar in der marianischen Lyrik wurde *Lingua mendax et dolosa* imitiert, vgl. Joseph SZÖVÉRFY, « Maria und die Häretiker. Ein Zisterzienserhymnus zum Albigenserkrieg », *Analecta Cisterciensia* 43 (1987) pp. 223-232, hier pp. 231-232 (zu *AH* 48, pp. 288-291, Nr. 293, Str. 12a).

⁶⁰ LATZKE, « Das Verwahrungsgedicht » (n. 7) pp. 167-173; Alison Goddard ELLIOTT, « The art of the inept exemplum: Ovidian deception in *Carmina Burana* 117 and 178 », *Sandalion* 5 (1982) pp. 353-368; Johannes HAMACHER, *Texte des Mittelalters für den Lateinunterricht* (Consilia Lehrerkommentare 9; Göttingen 1986) pp. 38-40.

⁶¹ Eine ähnliche Bewertung der falschen Zunge gibt Abaelard. Astral. 237-240 (vgl. TPMA Zunge 3.1; 7.18):

*Cum modicum membrum sit, lingua est maximus ignis:
Non tot per gladium, quot perire per hanc.
Preualet in lingua, qui non est fortis in armis:
Nullus in hac pugna plus meretrice potest.*

lung (Anapher, Geminatio, Trias, Klimax, Parallelismus) bestimmen nicht nur die erste Strophe, sondern den gesamten Text. Das Zusammenwirken von insistierender Wiederholung und inhaltlicher Hyperbolik machen das Lied zu einem wahren Virtuosenstück der Rhetorik, welches jedoch allein schon durch die dauernde Übersteigerung der Mittel seine Glaubwürdigkeit verliert:

1 *Lingua mendax et dolosa,
lingua procax, uenenosa,
lingua digna detruncari
et in igne concremari,*

Die rhetorisch gleich kunstvoll gestaltete 2. Strophe nennt den Grund für die einleitende Imprecatio. Ein Verleumder habe nämlich der Geliebten berichtet, dass die Persona, also ihr Liebhaber, ihr untreu geworden sei und eine neue Freundin liebe:

2 *Que me dicit deceptorem,
et non fidum amatorem,
quam amabam, dimisisse
et ad alteram transisse!*

Im Hauptteil des Gedichts (Str. 3-9) verwahrt sich die Persona gegen diese Vorwürfe, indem sie voller Pathos die Existenz einer neuen Freundin leugnet und in immer neuen Formeln die Liebe zu der alten bekräftigt. Wieder bestimmen Häufung und Hyperbel das Bild. Um die alte Freundin (und den Hörer) von ihrer Treue zu überzeugen, schwört die Persona bei den Musen, Jupiter, Phoebus Apollo, Mars, Cupido und schließlich sogar bei den Pfeilen und dem Bogen Cupidos (Str. 4-6). Was der Hörer, gebildet vom rhetorischen Prunk, erst bei genauerem Nachdenken versteht, ist, wie unpassend die Olympier und vollends Cupido als Garanten der Treue sind⁶². Vielmehr offenbart die Persona durch die Wahl der Götter ihre eigene Untreue und Unglaubwürdigkeit:

4 *Vnde iuro Musas nouem,
quod et maius est, per Iouem,
qui pro Dane sumpsit auri,
in Evropa formam thauri;*

Unter den zahlreichen biblischen und patristischen Parallelen fand ich noch die folgende interessante Übereinstimmung mit Prudentius, cath. 2, 101-104:

*Sic tota decurrat dies,
ne lingua mendax, ne manus
oculique peccent lubrici,
ne noxa corpus inquinat.*

⁶² Vgl. ELLIOTT (n. 60) pp. 359-360; HAMACHER (n. 60) p. 39.

5 *Iuro Phebum, iuro Martem,
qui amoris sciant artem;
iuro quoque te, Cupido,
arcum cuius reformido;*

6 *Arcum iuro cum sagittis,
quas frequenter in me mittis:
sine fraude, sine dolo
fedus hoc seruare uolo!*

Gleiches gilt für die Peroratio (Str. 10-11), in der 6 Adynata aneinandergereiht werden, so als müsse allein schon deren Menge die Freundin überzeugen. Den Abschluss aber bildet die absichtlich zweideutig gehaltene Formel *nisi fallar, non falleris* (Str. 11, 4), welche entweder schon einer Drohung gleichkommt (« Betrüge mich nicht, dann betrüge ich dich nicht ») oder voller Zynismus alle voraus gegangenen Treueschwüre einschränkt (« Wenn ich mich nicht irre, wirst du nicht betrogen »)⁶³. Bisher übersehen hatte man den theologischen Hintergrund dieser Formel, denn es ist auch eine Eigenschaft Gottes, niemanden zu täuschen und von niemandem getäuscht zu werden⁶⁴. Mit dieser blasphemischen Anmaßung eines göttlichen Prädikates beschließt die Persona ihr Lügengebilde, doch nicht ohne sich mit ihren eigenen Worten zu verraten:

10 *Ergo dum nox erit dies,
et dum labor erit quies,
et dum aqua erit ignis,
et dum silua sine lignis,*

11 *Et dum mare sine uelis,
et dum Partus sine telis,
cara michi semper eris:
nisi fallar, non falleris!*

⁶³ Auf diese Alternative weist HAMACHER (n. 60) pp. 39-40, hin.

⁶⁴ Beliebt ist die paronomastische Formel *Nec fallit, nec fallitur* seit Augustinus, wird aber unterschiedlichen Personen oder Begriffen beigelegt: Für Augustinus sind es die « Wahrheit » : Aug. serm. 107 (PL 38, col. 627) *Praecepit nobis Veritas, quae nec fallit, nec fallitur* ... oder die « Religion » : Aug. ciu. 8, 23, 3 (PL 41, col. 249; CC SL 47, p. 242) ... *sicut religio loquitur, quae nec fallit, nec fallitur*. Im Mittelalter ein Attribut Gottes: Ioh. Sarisb. poligr. 4, 7 (Webb vol. 1, p. 259); Petrarca secr. 3 (Carrara p. 197); im Spätmittelalter kommt sogar Aristoteles in den Genuss dieser Auszeichnung: Ricard. de Bury Philobiblon 14 *Est autem sapientis officium bene ordinare et alios et se ipsum secundum Phoebum philosophorum, Aristotelem, prooemio Metaphysicae, qui nec fallit, nec fallitur in humanis*. Vgl. TPMA Christus 2. – Die Formel kennt auch Abaelard. Astral. 81-82:

*Credere te numquam falli fallacia summa est,
Remque istam constat solius esse Dei.*

Die beiden Liebenden
(CF 5 *Nescio quid sit amor*)

Am Schluss meiner Interpretationen soll das Gedicht *Nescio quid sit amor* (CF 5)⁶⁵ stehen, welches nicht nur zu den schönsten Liebesgedichten des 12. Jahrhunderts gehört, sondern in vielfacher Hinsicht merkwürdig ist. Hier hält nicht mehr eine Persona einen Monolog, sondern es sprechen zwei Personae, Amicus und Amica, in einem Dialog miteinander, der es erlaubt, die Entwicklung ihrer Gefühle, ihrer Gedanken und der Handlung zu verfolgen. Im Gegensatz zu den rhythmischen und gereimten Strophen der vorangegangenen Lieder, ist dieses Gedicht in reimlosen elegischen Distichen abgefasst, aber verzichtet doch nicht auf die musikalischen Effekte der regelmäßigen Wiederholung von Vershälfen. Während die Amica nämlich in epanaleptischen Distichen spricht, nimmt der Amicus jedesmal in seiner Antwort inhaltliche Stichwörter aus der letzten Vershälfte der Amica auf, so dass der Dialog und der Gedankengang durch die insistierende Nennung noch enger verknüpft werden⁶⁶. Bemerkenswert ist außerdem, dass die Amica immer das erste Wort bekommt, auf welches der Amicus antwortet und reagiert. Im Schlusdistichon, das ohne Antwort bleibt, übernimmt die Amica auch in der Handlung die Initiative, indem sie den Amicus zum Liebesspiel auffordert.

Aufgrund der dialogischen Struktur und der Liebeswerbung hatte Hennig Brinkmann das Gedicht in die Nähe der Pastourelle rücken wollen⁶⁷, doch widerspricht dem der Inhalt: denn die beiden Personae sind Liebende, die sich von Anfang an zugetan sind, es fehlen die soziale Kluft zwischen dem adligen Ritter und dem Bauernmädchen, die so oft parodistische Absicht in der Zeichnung der Personen, desgleichen die für die Pastourelle typische Szenerie einer zufälligen Begegnung an einem ländlichen Locus amoenus, schließlich unterscheidet sich die Handlungsstruktur deutlich von der der Pastourelle, wohingegen unser Gedicht eher Motive der Komödie wie die

⁶⁵ WIC 11742 (*Nescio quid sit amor, noli me sollicitare*), 19743 (*Vrgeor immenso iam dum captus amore*). Edition: DELBOUILLE (n. 11) pp. 181-183. – Im Florentiner Codex sind die Buchstaben am rechten Seitenrand von fol. 131r stark abgerieben, so dass der Text kaum noch lesbar ist. Die Lücken in der Edition von Delbouille lassen sich jedoch durch Wilhelm Meyers Abschrift (Göttingen, SUB, Cod. W. Meyer VIII 7) und die Handschrift Gotha, Forschungsbibliothek, Memb. II 120 (fol. 52r-v = p. 103-104) schließen. – Vgl. Hans WALTHER, *Das Streitgedicht in der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* (Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters 5, 2; München 1920; Reprint Hildesheim 1984 mit Nachträgen von Paul Gerhard SCHMIDT) pp. 140-141.

⁶⁶ Zur insistierenden Nennung in den Gedichten Abaelards vgl. WOLLIN, «Zwei metrische Liebesepisteln» (n. 21) pp. 360-362, zum epanaleptischen Distichon ib. n. 33.

⁶⁷ BRINKMANN, *Geschichte* (n. 22) pp. 79-83; DELBOUILLE (n. 11) pp. 183-186.

alte Kupplerin aufnimmt. Mit dieser verfehlten Zuordnung⁶⁸ hatte man sich der Erkenntnis verschlossen, dass es sich bei *Nescio quid sit amor* um die dichterische Gestaltung der Liebeswerbung eines Mannes um eine gleichrangige Frau handelt, für die es in der mittellateinischen Dichtung nur wenige Beispiele gibt. Aus dem 12. Jahrhundert stammen: (1) das Gedicht *Conqueror et doleo* aus den *Carmina Riuipullensia* (CR 9)⁶⁹, das in regelmäßige Strophen von vier Hexametern gegliedert, vielleicht unter dem Eindruck unseres Gedichtes geschrieben wurde; (2) der bis in die Renaissance hinein vielgelesene Dialog *De iuvene et moniali* (auch Kleriker und Nonne)⁷⁰, dessen Bau in abwechselnden Distichen mit CF 5 übereinstimmt; und (3) der misogynen und zynischen Dialog *De iuvene et Thayde*, zwischen der Prostituierten Thais und ihrem Geliebten, der als 49. Fabel in dem als Schullektüre weithin beliebten metrischen *Esopus* steht, den wir seit Lessing als *Anonymus Neveleti* bezeichnen, der aber vermutlich von einem flämischen Dichter namens Verricus (Guerricus) verfasst wurde⁷¹.

Auch *Nescio quid sit amor* beginnt, so wie die anderen hier vorgestellten Gedichte, unmittelbar mit einer Personenrede, ohne dass die sprechende Persona mit Namen genannt oder charakterisiert würde. Der Florentiner Codex bietet als Verständnishilfe nur die Gliederung des Dialogs durch die regelmäßigen Sprecherbezeichnungen *Amica* und *Amicus*. Sonst aber fehlt jeglicher Hinweis auf die Situation, in welcher sich die Personae befinden. Diese muss der Rezipient erst im Laufe des Textes rekonstruieren⁷².

⁶⁸ So wird CF 5 in der Forschung nur als Beispiel einer mittellateinischen Pastourelle erwähnt: Rosemary WOOLF, « The construction of In a fryht as y con fare fremede », *Medium Aevum* 38 (1969) pp. 55-59; wieder in: EAD., *Art and Doctrine: Essays on Medieval Literature* (London / Ronceverte 1986) pp. 125-130.

⁶⁹ WIC 3178; MORALEJO (n. 15) pp. 218-229.

⁷⁰ Inc. *Me tibi teque michi genus, etas et decor equant*; WIC 10852; Inc. *Te michi meque tibi genus, etas et decor equant*; WIC 19053. Editionen: Hermann HAGEN, *Carmina medii aevi maximam partem inedita* (Bern 1877; Reprint Hildesheim 1975) pp. 206-207, Nr. CXXXII; Wilhelm WATTENBACH, « Aus einer Halberstadter Handschrift », *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit* N. F. 25 (1878) col. 313-320, 345-350, hier col. 319 (nach Città del Vaticano, BAV, Ms. Vat. Reg. lat. 344, fol. 30v); Armando BISANTI, « Il 'Contrasto' fra la monaca e il chierico nel cod. F.M. 17 della Biblioteca Regionale Centrale di Palermo », *Orpheus* N. S. 14 (1993) pp. 76-108, hier pp. 77-79; wieder in: ID., *Quattro studi sulla poesia d'amore mediolatina* (Spoleto 2011) pp. 105-156. – Vgl. WALTHER (n. 65) p. 140.

⁷¹ Inc. *Arte sua Thais iuvenes irretit: amorem*; WIC 1537. Maßgebliche Editionen: Wendelin FOERSTER (Hrsg.), *Lyoner Yzopet* (Altfranzösische Bibliothek 5; Heilbronn 1882; Reprint Wiesbaden 1968) pp. 126-127; Paola BUSDRAGHI (Hrsg.), *L'Esopus attribuito a Gualtiero Anglico* (Genova 2005) pp. 154-155. – Zum Dichter Verricus vgl. Carsten WOLLIN, « Das Rätsel des Anonymus Neveleti » (in Vorbereitung).

⁷² In einer sekundären Textfamilie des Gedichtes ist ein zusätzliches Distichon vorangestellt, das die Liebessehnsucht des Amicus, die sonst vom Leser aus dem Zusammenhang erschlossen werden muss, an den Anfang des Gespräches setzt. Da diese Textfassung entweder

«Ich weiß nicht, was Liebe ist» (*Nescio, quid sit amor*), das ist das Thema des Gedichts, mit welchem die Amica völlig unvermittelt einsetzt. Sie betont ihre Einfalt und Unerfahrenheit in Liebesdingen, weshalb sie den Amicus auffordert, sein Werben einzustellen. Doch lässt sich dieser nicht entmutigen. Er vermutet hinter ihrer vorgeschützten Unwissenheit vielmehr Neugier und Sympathie, weshalb er seine Werbung fortsetzt. Er verspricht, ihr zu zeigen, was Liebe ist:

- Amica.* *Ne<s>cio, quid sit amor. Noli me sollicitare!*
 Sum rudis et simplex: nescio, quid sit amor.
- Amicus.* *Quid sit amor, nescis. Ego, quid sit amare, docebo.*
 Tu, rudis et simplex, simplicitate places. (1-4)

Diesem Angebot des Amicus widerspricht die Amica nicht mehr, doch hält sie ihm im Folgenden immer wieder neue Argumente entgegen, welche ihre Liebe unmöglich machen. Doch scheint sie auf ihren eigenen Argumenten gar nicht weiter beharren zu wollen, denn jedesmal wenn der Amicus eines entkräftet, oder ihm auch nur widerspricht, nimmt sie das hin, legt ihm aber sogleich ein neues Problem vor. Man hat den Eindruck, dass die Amica ihren Amicus immer wieder auf neue Proben stellen möchte, die er bestehen muss, um ihre Liebe zu gewinnen. Auf diese Weise läuft der erste Abschnitt (V. 5-16) ab, in welchem der Amicus die Furcht der Amica vor dem zornigen Vater beschwichtigt, scheinheilig verspricht, ihre Jungfräulichkeit zu bewahren, und beteuert, dass sie mit weiblichem Geschick und Vorsicht den gefährlichen Klatsch der Leute vermeiden könne:

- Amica.* *Est pater asper homo. Timeo patris asperitatem:*
 Mors michi pena foret. Est pater asper homo.
- Amicus.* *Si pater asper homo, reddent mea uerba benignum.*
 Si patris ense rues, et pater ense meo.
- Amica.* *Virginitas placuit. Volo parcere uirginitati:*
 Res inmunda Venus. Virginitas placuit.
- Amicus.* *Virginitas tua sit, nec ego rogo uirginitatem.*
 Si maculem, quod amem, res inhonesta foret.

als Anhang zu der anonymen Komödie *Pamphilus* überliefert, oder sogar in deren Text selbst (nach V. 680) eingeschaltet wird, identifiziert sie die sprechenden Personae mit Pamphilus und Galathea, den Protagonisten der Komödie:

- Amicus.* *Vrgeor immenso iam dudum captus amore,*
 O Galathea, tuus Pamphilus aptus ego.

Diese Textfassung ist in nicht weniger als 14 Handschriften des *Pamphilus* überliefert, vgl. Franz G. BECKER (Hrsg.), *Pamphilus* (Beihefte zum Mlat. Jb. 9; Ratingen 1972) pp. 147-150; Kurt KLOOCKE, « Einige vergessene Verse des Pamphilus », *Romanische Forschungen* 85 (1973) pp. 527-531 (unvollständige Edition nach Wien, ÖNB, Cod. 303, fol. 85r-v).

- Amica.* *Fama ream faceret, si non rea criminis essem.
Et, licet inmerito, Fama ream faceret.*
- Amicus.* *Feminea tamen arte solent secreta latere.
Non est, quod timeas, si tibi provideas.* (5-16)

Der zweite Abschnitt (V. 17-28) beginnt mit der Frage der Amica nach einem geeigneten Ort für die heimliche Zusammenkunft (*Quis locus aptus erit?*). Ganz offensichtlich ist sie jetzt nicht weniger an der Liebe interessiert als der Amicus. Doch es reicht nicht aus, im Wald einen verschwiegenen und passenden Ort zu finden, denn zuvor muss die Amica sich der Wachsamkeit ihrer alten Amme (*anus ... nutrix*) entziehen. Der Amicus schlägt vor, die Wächterin durch Geschenke zu bestechen.

In den V. 27-28 wird zum ersten Mal der Dialog zwischen den Liebenden unterbrochen, indem sich der Amicus nicht mehr an die Amica, sondern an einen zuvor noch nicht aufgetretenen Diener (*puer*) wendet, der das für die Amme bestimmte Geschenk der Amica überbringen soll. Der Durchbrechung der Dialogform gesellt sich die Durchbrechung von Zeit und Raum hinzu, denn der Amicus kann ja nicht zu gleicher Zeit mit der Amica sprechen und zuhause seinem Diener Aufträge geben. Überhaupt stellt sich die Frage, wie, wo und wann die Liebenden so ungestört miteinander sprechen können wie in unserem Gedicht, wenn die Amica von der Amme im Haus bewacht wird. Der absichtliche Verzicht auf Zwischenhandlungen und Wartezeiten, wie sie in der Realität notwendig wären, sind allerdings die Voraussetzung für die fiktive Einheit des Gedichts⁷³:

- Amica.* *Quis locus aptus erit, quo conueniamus amantes?
Est pater usque domi. Quis locus aptus erit?*
- Amicus.* *Quis locus? Ecce locum nobis Natura parauit:
Nam tutas latebras proxima silua parat.*
- Amica.* *Est anus in thalamis nutrix michi sedula custos:
Non patet egressus. Est anus in thalamis.*
- Amicus.* *Corrumpatur anus, quasi corrumpitur iudex!
Preparat illa diem, preparat illa locum!*
- Amica.* *Munera mitte michi, quibus inuitetur ad <h>amum!
Per puerum tacite munera mitte michi!*
- Amicus.* *I cito, surge, puer, et munera defer ad illam!
Et refer, ut cumulet munera pollicitis!* (17-28)

⁷³ BRINKMANN, *Geschichte* (n. 22) pp. 81-82, hatte hierin nicht ein Zeichen von Fiktionalität sehen wollen, sondern vermutet, dass die V. 25-42 eine spätere Zudichtung sein könnten. Doch widerspricht dem die dichterische Einheit des Gedichts, dessen Gedankengang von Beginn an auf die Schlussverse 41-42 ausgerichtet ist.

Die Bestechung der habgierigen Amme durch Geschenke wird im dritten Abschnitt (V. 29-40) geschildert. Der Amicus sieht sich gezwungen, dem ersten Geschenk ein zweites hinzuzufügen, damit das erste nicht verloren ist. Er klagt, dass die Amme in ihrer Habgier einem Wassersüchtigen gleiche, der soviel trinken könne, wie er wolle, ohne jemals seinen Durst zu löschen⁷⁴. Doch müsse ein verdoppeltes Geschenk ausreichen, denn nur ein Gott verlange nach dreifachen Geschenken (Matth. 2,11). Schließlich lässt die Amme ihr Wohlwollen erkennen und versichert der Amica, dass sie nichts mehr zu fürchten habe:

- Amica.* *Non sibi sufficiunt tua munera: plura requirit.*
 Quamuis multa forent, non sibi sufficiunt.
- Amicus.* *Dum bibit ydropicus, magis et cupit et sitit undam:*
 Sic magis exardet semper auara lues.
- Amica.* *Ni precium duplices, duplex iactura uidetur.*
 Tum precium perdes, ni precium duplices.
- Amicus.* *Set timeo iam, si merces duplicabitur illi,*
 Ne duplicare uelit, quod duplicare potest.
- Amica.* *Perfida iurat anus nichil amplius esse timendum.*
 Per Stiga, per diuos perfida iurat anus.
- Amicus.* *Defer et ista, puer! Dii dona secunda secudent:*
 Solus in orbe deus munera terna petit. (29-40)

Das Gedicht schließt mit einem einzelnen Distichon der Amica (V. 41-42), die in vier Jubelrufen ihrer Freude über den Erfolg Ausdruck verleiht. Drei Ausrufe, durch das anaphorische *Iam* zusammengehalten, umschließen den vierten, in welchem sie den Amicus zum gemeinsamen Liebesspiel auffordert. Aber auch hier wahrt die Amica in ihrer Sprache die äußerste Dezenz, indem sie die sexuelle Vereinigung mit einer eleganten Periphrase verhüllt, sie wollten tun, « was einer allein nicht könne » (*Faciamus, quod nequid unus*⁷⁵). Diese Beobachtung trifft rückblickend auch für

⁷⁴ Obgleich der Vergleich des Habgierigen mit dem Wassersüchtigen seit der Antike topisch ist (vgl. TPMA Wassersucht, sowie die einschlägige Sekundärliteratur bei WOLLIN [n. 10] p. 145), ist die folgende Übereinstimmung doch bemerkenswert: Abaelard. Astral. 407-408:

Ydropico similis nemo est ut diues auarus,
Ex lucro lucri multiplicando sitim.

⁷⁵ Wilhelm Meyer (Göttingen, SUB, Cod. W. Meyer VIII 7) und DELBOUILLE (n. 11) p. 183 lesen in den Schriftesten des Florentiner Codex das letzte Wort als *anus*, während der Gothanus die Lesart *faciant duo quid nequid unus* bietet. Damit ist *unus* gesichert, selbst wenn für den Beginn des Satzes zwei beinahe gleichwertige Fassungen vorliegen. Es erscheint mir überhaupt unwahrscheinlich, dass der Dichter die Amica im Genuss ihrer Freude noch

die übrigen in diesem Aufsatz vorgestellten Gedichte zu⁷⁶. Das Wort *amor* muss als Bezeichnung für die Verliebtheit, die eheliche Liebe und die Sexualität ausreichen:

Amica. Iam fauet illa tibi! Faciamus, quod nequid unus!
Iam placet, ut uenias! Iam fauet illa tibi! (41-42)

Interessant ist dieser Abschluss, um zu verstehen, wie sich im Laufe des Gedichts die Gefühle der Amica verändern. Hatte sie zu Beginn die Werbung des Amicus noch verbal zurückgewiesen, so wird im Fortschreiten des Dialogs ihr Interesse an ihm immer deutlicher, auch wenn sie ihm immer neue Argumente gegen die Liebe vorhält. Schon in der Mitte des Gedichts möchte sie mit ihm zusammenkommen, allerdings müssen die Beiden zuvor einen passenden Ort finden und die Amme bestechen. Als schließlich alles vorbereitet ist, bricht die Amica in Jubel aus und übernimmt nun die Initiative, indem sie selbst den Amicus zum Liebesspiel auffordert. Hier schließt das Gedicht und das Übrige bleibt der Phantasie des Lesers überlassen.

5. Die Persona-Dichtung

Es ist deutlich geworden, dass wir in den hier vorgestellten Liedern keine private Korrespondenz vor uns haben, keine Liebeserklärungen, welche nur für die reale Geliebte bestimmt wären, und auch nicht eine (im naiven Sinne) autobiographisch zu deutende psychische Verarbeitung eigener Erlebnisse. Diese Lieder brauchen ein Publikum, vor dem sie zu schönen Melodien vorgetragen werden. In ihnen spricht auch nicht der Dichter, das « empirische Ich », sondern eine Persona, wie man seit der Antike das « lyrische Ich » nannte. Dabei spielen die Texte eine Reihe von bemerkenswerten Casus des Liebeslebens durch, doch immer in einer Weise, die den Hörer überrascht, unterhält und zum Nachdenken anregt.

Diese Art der Rollendichtung ist im 12. Jahrhundert nicht neu. Das (vielleicht etruskische) Wort *Persona* entstammt zunächst dem römischen Theater, wo es die Maske des Schauspielers bezeichnete, die er auf-

einen boshaften Seitenhieb auf die alte Amme, die zur Sexualität nicht mehr fähig sei, führen lassen sollte.

⁷⁶ Deutlich wird diese Vorliebe für Dezenz und Verhüllung an den einschlägigen Stellen der *Carmina Florentina*: CF 1, 8 ... *gratis in amplexus docta uenire meos*. CF 1, 53-54 ... *in complexibus ipsis / queque salitores querit habere nouos*. CF 2, 4, 3 ... *quis me demens dignetur tangere*. CF 4, 4, 3-4 *vnum erat summum negotium / laborare in latus socium*. CF 7, R *Amoris solamine uirgino cum uirgine*. / *Aro non in semine, pecco sine crimine*. CF 7, 6, 1 *Flos est: florem frangere non est res segura*. CF 7, 9, 3 *quintum, quod est agere, fuge suspicari!* CF 8, 1, 1-3 *Primo quasdam eligo, / et electas diligo, / et dilectas subigo*.

setzen musste, um eine bestimmte Person zu verkörpern, um seine Rolle zu spielen⁷⁷. Ausgenutzt wurden die Möglichkeiten einer fiktiven Persona in der Literatur schon von den römischen Elegikern und Satirikern, sicherlich auch in der Lyrik des Horaz. Einen bunten Durchgang durch alle erdenklichen Konstellationen und Situationen der menschlichen Liebe bieten die *Amores* Ovids, in denen das eigene Erleben hinter der literarischen Gestaltung und Fiktion völlig unkenntlich geworden ist.

Im Hochmittelalter wird die Rollendichtung zuerst bei den Dichtern des sogenannten « Loire-Kreises » deutlich greifbar⁷⁸. Marbod von Rennes (1035-1123), der lange Jahre Scholasticus in Angers war, bevor er 1096 zum Bischof von Rennes erhoben wurde, schrieb als erster Liebesgedichte, welche durch ihre originale Überschrift als Rede einer fiktiven Persona (*sub assumpta persona*) gekennzeichnet sind. Das gibt ihm die Möglichkeit, sogar einen Homosexuellen oder einen älteren Liebhaber auftreten zu lassen, ohne damit größeren moralischen Anstoß zu erregen. Ähnliches finden wir bei Baudri von Bourgueil, bei Serlo von Wilton, in der Schule des Bernardus Silvestris und in der Dichtung des Peter von Blois. Aber nicht nur die lateinische Liebesdichtung ist in der Regel Persona-Dichtung, sondern in weiten Teilen auch die volkssprachliche, also die Lyrik der Trobadors, der Trouvères und der Minnesänger. Auch hier bietet die Rollenlyrik in vielen Fällen erst den passenden Schlüssel zum richtigen Verständnis der Texte.

Kommen wir nun zu den Ergebnissen der vorausgegangenen Interpretationen. Entscheidend ist, dass schon die Persona selbst ein Zeichen von Fiktionalität ist, das heißt, dass die Aussagen der 1. Person Singular nicht als Schilderung eines Erlebnisses gelten dürfen, das man biographisch deuten müsse. Dafür spricht der völlige Verzicht auf Eigennamen, Zeit- und Ortsangaben und eine soziale Einordnung der Personen. Der Dichter geht aber bisweilen weiter, indem er die Texte bewusst durch die Nennung antiker Gottheiten verfremdet, welche im christlichen Kontext nur als poetische Fiktion denkbar sind. Dazu gehören auch die in CF 2 angerufenen

⁷⁷ Vgl. Manfred FUHRMANN, « Persona, ein römischer Rollenbegriff », in: *Identität (Poetik und Hermeneutik 8)*, hrsg. Odo MARQUARD / Karlheinz STIERLE (München 1979) pp. 83-106; wieder in: Id., *Brechungen* (Stuttgart 1982) pp. 21-46; Manfred FUHRMANN, « Person, I », in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie* 7 (1989) col. 269-283; Bernard SCHOULER / Jean Yves BORIAUD, « Persona », in: *Historisches Wörterbuch der Rhetorik* 6 (2003) col. 789-810.

⁷⁸ Vgl. Gerald A. BOND, *The Loving Subject. Desire, Eloquence, and Power in Romanesque France* (Philadelphia Penn. 1995) pp. 42-98; Próspero SAÍZ, *Personae and Poiesis. The Poet and the Poem in Medieval Love Lyric* (The Hague / Paris 1976). – Günther SCHWEIKLE, *Minnesang* (Sammlung Metzler 244; Stuttgart 1989, ²1995) pp. 192-195 mit wichtigen Literaturhinweisen.

namenlosen Gottheiten. Der Höhepunkt der Fiktionalität wird aber in CF 5 erreicht, wenn der Dichter, allein um die Einheit von Inhalt und Form des Dialoges bemüht, kurzerhand die Schranken von Raum und Zeit durchbricht. Schon die poetologische Diskussion der Zeit sieht die Fiktionalität als grundlegendes Kennzeichen der Persona-Dichtung, wenn nämlich Marbod seine Gedichte, in welchen der Dichter eine Maske aufsetzt und als fremde Person spricht, mit *sub assumpta persona* überschreibt.

Durch das Auftreten einer fiktiven Persönlichkeit kommt es zu der grundsätzlichen Trennung von Autor und Persona, welche jede Deutung in entscheidender Weise bestimmt. Indem Autor und Rezipient sich von der sprechenden Persona distanzieren können, wird es unmöglich, den Inhalt gerade der Liebesgedichte nur als Wunscherfüllungsphantasien zu deuten. Die mehrfache Brechung (Dichter – Persona – Rezipient) macht eine einsinnige Deutung unmöglich und verleiht den Texten eine schillernde Vieldeutigkeit. Die Trennung zwischen Dichter und Persona macht es überhaupt erst möglich, die Persona in CF 8 Meinungen und Standpunkte ausdrücken zu lassen, welche der Dichter aus religiösen oder moralischen Erwägungen heraus vermutlich nicht als die eigenen würde vertreten haben. Er kann eine problematische und von der herrschenden Moral nicht akzeptierte Meinung von der Persona vortragen lassen, während er sich zugleich ironisch von der Persona, aber indirekt auch von der Moral distanziert. Die Persona verschafft ihm die Möglichkeit, diese Meinung einmal öffentlich auszusprechen, ohne selbst der moralischen Ächtung zu verfallen. Damit erlaubt diese literarische Technik erst das Dichten und den Vortrag von Liebesliedern, denn nur durch das Auftreten der Persona bekommt der Dichter die Freiheit, die vielfachen Spielarten menschlicher Liebe und Sexualität darzustellen.

Allerdings macht die Persona es dem Hörer nicht leicht, in ihre fiktionale Welt einzutreten, da dieser aus den knappen Anspielungen die Identität der Persona und die Situation erst erschließen und sich in seiner eigenen Phantasie vorstellen muss. Somit wird die beständige Mitarbeit des Hörers bzw. Lesers zur notwendigen Voraussetzung für die gelungene Rezeption. Durch die gezielte Auswahl von Informationen, welche der Dichter der Persona in den Mund legt, hat er die Lenkung des Hörers vollkommen in seiner Hand, so dass er ihn genau in die Richtung führen kann, die er beabsichtigt. Wie wir es am Beispiel der Malmariée in CF 2 gesehen haben, kann der Dichter sogar falsche Erwartungen aufbauen, um den Rezipienten solange in die falsche Richtung zu führen, bis er ihn in einer überraschenden Pointe « enttäuscht ».

In fast allen hier vorgestellten Gedichten ist es die Persona selbst, die in ihrem Monolog schrittweise Gedanken enthüllt, die sie besser für sich behalten hätte. Dieses Verfahren der Demaskierung ist es aber, das

eine affektive Identifizierung des Rezipienten mit der Persona verhindert und die nötige Distanz herstellt. Vielmehr wird der Rezipient zum Lachen angeregt, wenn er die Differenz zwischen seiner eigenen Erwartung und den eigentlichen Wünschen und Absichten der Persona bemerkt, welche diese vor ihm offenlegt.

In allem aber zeigt sich die Freude des Dichters am Spiel: Zunächst im Erfinden von Personae und von außergewöhnlichen oder interessanten Situationen, dann im gedanklichen Aufbau des Gedichts, mit dessen Hilfe der Dichter den Leser so lenkt, wie er es wünscht, auch in der Darstellung von bestimmten Casus des Liebeslebens, die ihren Reiz gerade durch den Kontrast zur (unausgesprochenen) christlichen Moral erhalten, und schließlich durch die Distanz zu den Problemen, welche die Personae ernst nehmen müssen, über welche Dichter und Rezipienten aber lachen dürfen.

6. Die Liebeskonzeption

Ich habe mich bei den vorangehenden Interpretationen immer wieder gefragt, welches Bild und welche Konzeption von Liebe in diesen Gedichten zu finden sind. Man kann, wie ich meine, folgende Punkte festhalten.

Die Liebe ist nicht nur eine von vielen Leidenschaften, welche die Menschen bewegen, sondern vielmehr die Macht, die alles regiert (CF 6, 7b, 2 *regit Amor omnia*; CF 7, 1, 1 *Amor habet superos*). Sie ist der von der Natur dem Menschen gegebene Trieb zur Fortpflanzung, dem der Mensch in seiner Jugend folgen muss (CF 8). Trotz der anfänglichen weiblichen Scheu und Zurückhaltung ist es schließlich sogar die Amica in CF 5, die über das bevorstehende Zusammensein mit ihrem Amicus in Freudenjubiläum ausbricht. Aber die Liebe, die sich doch ganz auf den geliebten Menschen richtet, ist nicht selbstlos. Wieviel Egoismus sich hinter ihr verborgen hält, zeigen uns die Gedichte von der Malmariée (CF 2), dem keuschen Liebhaber (CF 7) oder der bombastischen Verwahrung gegen den Vorwurf der Untreue (CB 117), in denen die egoistischen Absichten und das Verhalten der Persona demaskiert werden. Bisweilen treibt die Liebe den Menschen sogar zu Handlungen an, die er sonst vermeiden würde, so dass sie bedrohlich, ja sogar zerstörerisch wird, wenn man einmal an die berühmten unglücklichen Liebespaare der Geschichte denkt (CF 6, 4b-7a). Es scheint ganz so, als könnte es keine glückliche Liebe geben, oder als wäre diese für den Dichter kein der Mühe lohnendes Thema.

Besonders auffällig ist es aber, dass in diesen Gedichten nirgends Moralvorstellungen, Lehren oder Vertreter des Christentums genannt werden. Vielmehr gewinnt man den Eindruck, dass alles Christliche

absichtlich vermieden wird. An keiner Stelle wird die Liebe an asketischen Normen gemessen, christlich konnotierte Wörter werden, wenn überhaupt, nur parodistisch gebraucht, Kleriker treten nicht auf und selbst der christliche Gott wird durch einen oder mehrere namenlose Götter, an anderer Stelle durch die Olympier verdrängt. Auch wenn das Verhalten verliebter Menschen in der Regel als egoistisch, berechnend oder nur als lächerlich entlarvt wird, so nimmt der Dichter doch niemals eine moralische Bewertung vor. In prägnanter Form zusammengefasst werden diese Gedanken in dem anonymen Epigramm CB 121a, welches die Gruppe der Liebesgedichte aus dem « Kreis des Hilarius » in den *Carmina Burana* beschließt⁷⁹:

*Non est crimen amor, quia, si scelus esset amare,
Nollet amore Deus etiam diuina ligare.*

Interessant ist es auch, zu überlegen, was in den Gedichten des Kreises um Abaelard fehlt. Das sind zunächst einmal die schönen Seiten der Liebe. Wir lesen hier keine detaillierten Beschreibungen menschlicher Schönheit, wie sie in der Schule seit dem 11. Jahrhundert geübt wurden und die bis in die frühe Neuzeit hinein fast überall ein unverzichtbarer Bestandteil der Liebesdichtung waren. In diesen *Descriptiones* versuchten die Dichter oft, sich in der sprachlichen Raffinesse gegenseitig zu überbieten, wohingegen eine Beschreibung des wirklichen Menschen gar nicht beabsichtigt war. Aber wahrscheinlich fehlen die *Descriptiones* im « Kreis des Abaelard » gerade aus diesem Grunde. Wenn tatsächlich einmal die Schönheit der Geliebten gepriesen wird (CB 117, 8-9), dann geschieht das mit der Absicht, der Geliebten zu schmeicheln, also in Übereinstimmung mit der dem Gedicht zugrunde liegenden rhetorischen Strategie, nicht aber um der Beschreibung selbst.

Es fehlt auch die Darstellung des gemeinsamen Liebesglücks oder der sexuellen Erfüllung, denn die sprechende Persona befindet sich meistens in einer Situation, die von dem Ziel ihrer Liebe weit entfernt ist. Wenn das Zusammensein detailreich geschildert wird, dann ist es wie in CB 116 nur ein sexueller Tagtraum. Am Ende des Liebesdialogs in CF 5 lässt der Dichter über die bevorstehende Vereinigung der Liebenden den Vorhang fallen. Ob das Glück in der Liebe sich überhaupt verwirklichen lässt ist, wird im Licht des zu Anfang Gesagten natürlich zweifelhaft, ein Thema der Liebesdichtung ist es jedoch nicht.

In diesen Gedichten begegnen wir auch nicht der pseudo-antiken, mythologischen Traumwelt oder der Utopie des Locus

⁷⁹ WIC 12025; WPS 17609. Editionen: SCHUMANN, *Liebeslieder* (n. 37) p. 203; VOLLMANN, *Carmina Burana* (n. 37) pp. 438-439, Kom. p. 1109.

amoenus, in welchen andere Dichter ihre Handlung gerne ansiedeln. Gerade diese literarischen Fiktionen wurden von den Zeitgenossen wie Bernardus Silvestris, Peter von Blois und anderen Dichtern in den *Carmina Burana* außerordentlich geschätzt und mit größter Virtuosität gehandhabt. Bei den Dichtern des «Kreises um Abaelard» bleiben die Hinweise auf das Wirken eines oder auch mehrerer Götter ganz im Allgemeinen. Trotzdem reichen sie aus, um die Situation aus dem Bereich des Christlichen zu entfernen. Auch bei den Gestalten des antiken Mythos (CB 117) handelt es sich in erster Linie um die Referenz auf allgemein bekanntes Bildungsgut. Damit befinden sich die Gedichte gleichsam in einem nichtchristlichen Raum der Phantasie und Fiktion.

Interessant ist auch das Fehlen eines sozialen Rangunterschiedes zwischen Mann und Frau. Die Geliebte besitzt in diesen Liedern keinen höheren sozialen Rang als der Liebhaber. Von der Anbetung einer Dame oder einem Dienstverhältnis des Liebhabers im Sinne des Feudalsystem findet sich keine Spur. Desgleichen fehlt die gleichsam religiöse Anbetung der Dame, die sich sonst so oft mit der Marienverehrung berührt. Auch auf die parodistische Darstellung einer Person als Angehöriger des dritten Standes, als Bauer und *vilain*, wird verzichtet. Wie schon oben angesprochen, wird auch mit keinem Wort darauf hingewiesen, dass es sich bei Dichter, Sänger und Publikum um Kleriker (und ihre Familien) handeln muss, da doch nur diesen das Lateinische als Bildungssprache zugänglich war.

Wenn der Zuhörer gezwungen wird, sich in die fiktive Welt der Persona hineinzusetzen, dann ist es nicht ohne Interesse, sich diese genauer anzuschauen. Da jegliche Hinweise auf das vom Klerus vertretene Christentum und seine Moral oder die kriegerische Lebenswelt des Adels fehlen, möchte man die vorsichtige Hypothese wagen, dass wir uns in einer städtischen Lebenswelt und frühbürgerlichen Gesellschaft befinden, in der reich und arm existieren und der soziale Aufstieg nach dem Einkommen bewertet wird (CF 2). Es ist vermutlich die Welt der hohen Schulen, an denen eine immer wachsende Zahl von Studenten sich bemühte, die lateinische Sprache zu erlernen und in angemessener Weise als internationale Verkehrssprache zu handhaben, um sich dann den eigentlichen Disziplinen der Theologie, Rechtswissenschaft und Medizin zuwenden zu können. Wir haben also in den Liebesliedern des «Kreises um Abaelard» den Zeitvertreib einer städtischen Bildungselite, der «Intellektuellen»⁸⁰ des Hochmittelalters vor uns, die sich auch institutionell durch die Gründung privater Schulen und Universitäten immer weiter von der Kirche entfernte.

⁸⁰ Vgl. Jacques LE GOFF, *Les intellectuels au Moyen Âge* (Paris 1957, ²1985); dt. Übers.: ID., *Die Intellektuellen im Mittelalter* (Stuttgart 1986).

Versucht man eine ungefähre chronologische Einordnung dieser Lieder, dann kommen als Vorbilder einerseits die römische Liebesdichtung Ovids, vielleicht sogar die des Horaz, in Betracht, andererseits die Dichtungen des «Loire-Kreises» oder der ostfranzösischen Tradition eines Gottfried von Reims. Wenn sie tatsächlich zur Zeit Abaelards und seiner Schüler um 1100-1140 geschrieben wurden, stehen sie zeitlich noch am Anfang der provenzalischen Liebesdichtung, ungefähr zeitgleich mit den ersten Trobadors, wie Wilhelm von Poitiers, Jaufré Rudel oder Marcabru, während sich die frühe nordfranzösische, überwiegend anonym erhaltene Liebesdichtung kaum sicher datieren lässt und der deutsche Minnesang noch nicht einmal begonnen hat. In die vielfältige Diskussion des 12. Jahrhunderts über die Liebe⁸¹ lassen sich unsere Gedichte nicht so einfach einfügen. Ihrem Inhalt und ihrer literarischen Form nach sind sie selbständig und originell. Sie sträuben sich gleichsam dagegen, einer bestimmten Liebeskonzeption zugerechnet zu werden. Ihre Position wird man also in Zukunft erst noch genauer zu bestimmen haben.

Ich möchte mit einer letzten Überlegung zum Ende kommen. Die Persona-Dichtung erzeugt eine ironische Distanz des Dichters und Rezipienten zu den Gefühlen und Meinungen der sprechenden Personae. Gerade diese Distanz benutzen die Dichter des «Kreises um Abaelard» auch, um sich von der Macht der Liebe, die sie nicht selten als bedrohlich empfinden, zu distanzieren. Wenn sie diese nicht nur in ihrer wahren, also egoistischen und rücksichtslosen Gestalt bloßstellen, sondern sogar noch parodistisch überzeichnen, dann können sie sich im Lachen für eine kurze Zeit über sie erheben. Ihre Liebesdichtung erscheint auch als ein Versuch der Selbstbefreiung mit Hilfe der Ironie und des Lachens.

⁸¹ Vgl. Rüdiger SCHNELL, «Ovids ars amatoria und die höfische Minnetheorie», *Euphonia* 69 (1975) pp. 132-159; ID., «Hohe und niedere Minne», *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie* 98 (1979) pp. 19-52; ID., *Causa Amoris* (n. 42). – Peter DINZELBACHER, «Über die Entdeckung der Liebe im Hochmittelalter», *Saeculum* 32 (1981) pp. 185-208; ID., «Mittelalterliche Sexualität – die Quellen», in: Daniela ERLACH / Markus REISENLEITNER / Karl VOCELKA (Hrsg.), *Privatisierung der Triebe? Sexualität in der Frühen Neuzeit* (Frankfurt am Main 1994) pp. 47-110. – Wenig ergiebig für unser Thema ist John W. BALDWIN, *The Language of Sex. Five Voices from Northern France around 1200* (Chicago 1994).

Verzeichnis der benutzten Abkürzungen

TPMA	<i>Thesaurus Proverbiorum Medii Aevi</i> , vol. 1-13 (Berlin/New York 1995-2003).
WIC	Hans WALTHER, <i>Carmina medii aevi posterioris Latina I/1. Initia carminum ac versuum medii aevi posterioris Latinorum</i> (Göttingen ² 1969).
WPS	Hans WALTHER, <i>Carmina medii aevi posterioris Latina II/1-5. Proverbia sententiaeque Latinitatis medii aevi</i> , vol. 1-5 (Göttingen 1963-1967).

Summary

The five medieval Latin love poems presented in this article come from two small collections of songs that may have originated in the years about 1100-1140 in the entourage of the famous philosopher and theologian Peter Abelard (1079-1142/43) and his pupil Hilary of Orléans: the so-called *Carmina Florentina* and a group of the *Carmina Burana* (CB 88a, 95, 116-121). Both collections exhibit striking similarities: their authors exclusively make use of the techniques of the lyric-self (*Persona-Dichtung*) as distinct from the empirical author, and describe, even praise their characters' sentiments on human love without any moral censure. In this respect the songs bear witness of the beginning emancipation of human love from the ascetic and repressive teaching of the medieval church in the twelfth century.

Hélinand avant Froidmont : à la recherche d'un « trouvère » perdu

Marie-Geneviève GROSSEL

(Valenciennes)

Contrairement à bien des écrivains du Moyen Âge, nous possédons sur l'auteur des *Vers de la Mort* un certain nombre de détails biographiques que les médiévistes modernes ont recueillis avec un soin jaloux. Il est bon cependant, avant toute analyse, de les recenser et de distinguer ceux qui sont sûrs, ceux qui sont probables, ceux qui restent (très) hasardeux. Il y a les confidences du cistercien lui-même qui nous sont parvenues par Vincent de Beauvais – auquel on fera confiance. Il y a des faits que suggère l'œuvre vernaculaire... et puis, il y a le reste.

I – C'est dans la *Patrologia Latina* de Jacques-Paul Migne que se trouvent la majorité des renseignements qu'utilise la critique moderne. En ce qui concerne les origines du moine de Froidmont, Migne recopie ce qu'Hélinand nous a confié dans sa *Chronique* aux dates de 1126-27 :

Chronique an. 1126. Carolus comes Flandrorum proditione quorundam procerum suorum Brugis in ecclesia orans occisus est.¹

[année 1126. Charles, comte de Flandre, à la suite de la trahison de certains des Grands de son entourage fut assassiné alors qu'il priait dans une église.]

Chronique an. 1127. In auctores sceleris acerrime vindicatum est a Ludovico Francorum rege Philippi filio ; ita ut etiam nonnulli ad rotam damnati sunt. Eorum progenies tota exsiliata est ; et multi innocentes quæ non rapuerant exsoluerunt ; inter quos fuerunt pater meus Hermanus et frater ejus Ellebaudus qui pueri nobiles et pulcherrimi, magnis hæreditatibus perditis, de Flandriis in Franciam aufugerunt.

[année 1127. Louis, roi des Français, fils de Philippe, exerça une vengeance des plus cruelles contre les auteurs de ce crime, au point même que certains furent condamnés à la roue. Toute leur parenté fut contrainte à l'exil, et beaucoup d'innocents payèrent pour ce qu'ils n'avaient pas dérobé. Parmi ces derniers, il y avait mon père, Hermann, et son frère Ellebaud, qui étaient de tout jeunes gens nobles et magnifiques ; ayant perdu leur grand héritage, ils se réfugièrent de Flandre en France.]

¹ J.-P. MIGNE, *Patrologia Latina*, t. 212, Paris, 1855, pp. 771-1082 ; citation p. 1028.

Pour les mêmes faits, Aubri de Trois Fontaines², qui connaît parfaitement Hélinand et qui était également un moine blanc, se contente de renvoyer à ce passage d'Hélinand sans le développer, après s'être assez longuement fondé sur Gui de Bazoches :

Chronicon. Rex Francorum Ludovicus, militie gestis et regia magnanimitate preclarus, quanta regem decuit, exercuit indignatione vindictam in quosdam Flandrensium nobilium proditores, qui dominum suum, comitem Flandrie Karolum, quem quia malefactores extirpare nitebatur et raptores e suis finibus oderant, confoderant gladiis Deum orantem in ecclesia et crucis ad instar expansis in terra manibus adorantem.³

[Louis, roi des Français, très illustre par ses exploits militaires et sa magnificence royale comme il sied à un roi, exerça avec indignation sa vengeance contre ceux des nobles flamands qui, dans leur haine, avaient trahi leur seigneur, le comte Charles de Flandre, parce qu'il s'efforçait de faire disparaître les malfaiteurs et les pillards de ses terres, et qui l'avaient transpercé de leurs glaives alors qu'il priait dans une église, prosterné sur le sol, bras en croix dans son adoration.]

Mais Aubri a déjà longuement raconté les événements tragiques de Bruges en s'appuyant sur la *Vita Karoli* de Galbert ; le notaire brugeois, quant à lui, évoque, sans autres détails, à deux reprises des « innocents » ; certains auraient payé pour les coupables, en étant précipités du haut d'une tour :

Quelques-uns se flattaient d'échapper *parce qu'ils étaient innocents*, mais comme leur destinée les entraînait et que la vengeance divine les avaient unis avec les traîtres, ils furent aussi précipités.⁴

D'autres auraient été condamnés à l'exil quand le roi Louis obtint des habitants de Bruges, sur la foi d'un serment solennel, le nom de divers seigneurs et bourgeois qui avaient, à un moment ou l'autre, accepté d'aider les « traîtres » en leur apportant quelque secours :

² *Chronica Albrici monachi Trium Fontium a monacho Novi Monasterii Hoiensis interpolata*, MGH XXIII, 1874, pp. 631-950 (édition partielle P. SCHEFFER-BOICORST).

³ Aubri de Trois Fontaine, op. cit., p. 827.

⁴ Traduction de F. GUIZOT, *Vie de Charles le Bon*, Paris, Brière, 1825 (Collection des Mémoires relatifs à l'Histoire de France), XVII p. 381 ; les italiques sont de nous ; texte latin dans *Galbertus notarius Brugensis, De mulrto, traditione et occisione gloriosi Karoli comitis Flandriarum*, ed. J. RIDER, Brepols, Turnhout, 1994, p. 133 § 81 : « Quorum quidam speraverant evadere, quia innumes traditionis extiterant. Sed quia fata eos trahebant, immo divina ultio coegit, cum illis qui traditionis rei fuerant, præcipitati sunt. » [5 mai 1127]. Voir aussi H. PIRENNE, *Histoire du meurtre de Charles le Bon, comte de Flandre, par Galbert de Bruges*, Paris, Picard, 1891, avec ce commentaire p. 125 : « Tous les défenseurs furent exécutés, sans procès, même ceux qui n'avaient pas participé au meurtre de Charles le Bon, Guillaume de Normandie avait en effet promis aux *Principes* de récupérer les biens des meurtriers. »

Le roi et le comte par le conseil commun des barons de la terre, les condamnèrent *comme coupables*⁵ et rendirent contre eux un arrêt de proscription.⁶

On peut penser que les parents d'Hélinand se trouvaient parmi ces derniers. Comme d'autre part, il évoque son père Hermann et son oncle Ellebaud sous le terme de *pueri*, ce dut être ses grand-parents qui s'exilèrent de Flandre en France⁷.

Selon Antoine Loisel⁸, Hélinand serait né à Pruneroi ou Pront-le-roi⁹ dans le Beauvaisis. Mais cette localisation trop précise reste une hypothèse dénuée de preuves sûres, laquelle a néanmoins poussé l'abbé Renet à proposer :

Hélebaud, oncle d'Hélinand fut, dit-on, chambellan de Monsieur Henry (de France), archevesque de Rheims, ancien évêque de Beauvais. Hermann se serait attaché à la famille des seigneurs de Pronleroy-en-Beauvaisis.¹⁰

Renet ne reprend ici à Loisel (derrière Hélinand lui-même) que la première partie de la phrase ; le reste est une simple supposition. Monique

⁵ Les italiques sont de nous.

⁶ « [...] quos rex et comes communi consilio terræ baronum reos condemnaverant et proscriptioni decreverant. » [17 septembre 1127], p. 132. La liste de tous ceux qui furent pros crits se trouve dans le *Chronicon Hanoniense quod dicitur Balduini Avennensis*, MGH XXV, 1880 – ed. J. HELLER, pp. 414-467, et comprend 116 noms, pp. 441-443, parmi lesquels, très probablement, se trouve celui du père d'Hermann et d'Ellebaud :

« Dont volt li quens Guillaumes et li barons ordener que tuit fuissent desheryté et bani de Flandres a tous jours, mais li menus peuples qui la estoit disoit que trop seroit grans dolours ne chou ne lor sambloit pas raisons que cil qui estoient ou menor criemes fuissent pugni d'autretel com cil qui estoient dou plus grant [...] fu esgardé par le conte Guillaume et par son conseil que tuit cil [...] fuissent escillé a tous jours et deshyreté lour enfant et li enfant de lour enfans sans nulle misericorde. »

⁷ C'était déjà la conclusion de l'auteur de l'*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, t. XVIII (suite du XIII^e siècle), Paris, 1835, Kraus Reprint, Nendeln/Liechtenstein, 1971, édition posthume de la notice de Dom BRIAL sur Hélinand, p. 87-103, voir p. 88.

⁸ *Mémoires des pays, villes, comté et comtes, evesché et esvesques et pairrie, commune et personnes de renom de Beauvais et Beauvaisis*, Paris, 1597, cf. *infra*.

⁹ Village successivement appelé Pruneroi, Pruneroy, Pront-le-Roi et Pron-l'Oise (sous la Révolution), aujourd'hui Pronleroy, Oise, Picardie, à 21 km au N.-O. de Compiègne.

¹⁰ Abbé RENET, *Saint Lucien et les autres saints du Beauvaisis, études historiques, liturgiques, chronologiques*, t. III, Beauvais, 1894, p. 858. Disons tout de suite, pour n'y plus revenir, que l'étude de l'abbé RENET, très riche quand elle s'occupe des traditions de son « petit pays », très documentée dans les Écritures diverses (y compris les Pères Grecs) et la liturgie, n'est pas toujours sûre pour ce qui est de l'Histoire du Moyen Âge, l'auteur se laisse parfois même franchement entraîner par une totale confiance envers ses sources hagiographiques, voir la défense de l'identité entre Denys l'Aréopagite, Denys l'évêque de Paris et Denys, disciple de Paul, appuyée (certes !) sur les textes médiévaux et le rejet (un peu rapide) de ce qu'en dit Abélard.

Santucci¹¹, pour sa part, propose avec prudence le village d'Angivilliers, situé tout près de Pruneroi¹²; elle se fonde pour étayer cette hypothèse sur la strophe X des *Vers de la Mort*, qui semble impliquer que les habitants de ce village avaient des prétentions à la coquetterie et l'élégance¹³:

Morz [...]
 Di moi a çaus d'Angiviler
 Que tu fais t'aguille enfiler
 Dont tu lor veus cosdre lor manches. (X, v. 1 et 10-12)

On peut imaginer qu'avant la savante médiéviste, Loisel avait utilisé le même type d'argument pour choisir Pronleroi:

Morz, trai ton cor et si le sonne
 A Proneroi et a Peronne... (VI, v. 1-2)

Même si le goût de l'allitération a dû être pour beaucoup dans le choix des deux bourgs, il est tout-à-fait évident que Pruneroi comme Angivilliers, villages minuscules, n'étaient connus que de leurs voisins! On peut ainsi estimer sans trop de risques qu'Hélinand était né dans ce *petit pays* picard.

L'oncle paternel d'Hélinand, nommé Ellebaud, devint *cubicularius* [chancelier]¹⁴ de l'archevêque de Reims, Henri de France, le propre frère du roi Louis VII, ce qui laisse entendre qu'Ellebaud était un clerc et, probablement, un cadet. A son tour, Hélinand fera des études assez poussées, fréquentant l'école-cathédrale de Beauvais, sous le maître Raoul auquel il adresse dans sa *Chronique* un petit salut au passage:

¹¹ Hélinand de Froidmont, *Les Vers de la Mort, Poème du XII^e siècle*, traduit en Français moderne par M. BOYER et M. SANTUCCI, Paris, Champion, 1983, p. 13.

¹² Angivilliers, Oise, est à 24 km au N.-E. de Nogent-sur-Oise, la distance entre Angivilliers et Pruneroi est de 2 km.

¹³ La coutume de coudre sur soi ses manches chaque matin pour qu'elles soient plus étroitement collées au bras et de les découdre le soir, célèbre surtout par l'allusion qu'en fait Guillaume de Lorris au tout début de son *Roman de la Rose*, était une mode particulièrement prisée par les jeunes élégants. Elle est également évoquée dans la version anonyme en vers du *Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat* – ed. J. SONET, t. II, Namur, 1952, v. 2171, datée du XIII^e siècle. L'allusion d'Hélinand est remarquablement antérieure.

¹⁴ *Helinandi Frigidi Montis monachi Flores a Vincentio Bellovacensi collecti*, PL, t. 212, cap XII, *De cognitione sui*, p. 721 sq.: « De qua re [...] referebat exemplum patruus meus Hellebaudus, Henrici quondam Remensis archiepiscopi cubicularius... » [A ce sujet mon grand-père Ellebaud, qui fut jadis chancelier de l'archevêque de Reims Henri, racontait cet exemple...]. Hélinand rapporte ici une « chasse volante », connue dans la littérature du Moyen Âge sous le nom de *Mesnie Hellequin*: perçu la nuit dans les profondeurs d'une forêt déserte, ce « tumulte d'âmes en peine » était interprété comme présage mortel pour qui l'entendait. C'est donc très incidemment qu'Hélinand révèle ici l'office de son grand-père Ellebaud auprès de l'archevêque Henri de France.

Chronicon an. 1142. Hujus etiam Petri Abælardi discipulus fuit magister meus, qui me docuit a puero, Radulphus natione Anglicus, cognomento Grammaticus, Ecclesiæ Belvacensis, vir tam in divinis quam in sæcularibus litteris eruditus.¹⁵

[Année 1142. Raoul mon maître qui m'enseigna dès l'enfance, fut disciple de ce Pierre Abélard, il était anglais de par son origine et surnommé le Grammairien, il appartenait à l'Église de Beauvais, c'était un homme d'une grande instruction aussi bien dans les sciences divines que dans les lettres de ce monde.]

et, par delà les rudiments de l'apprentissage, poursuivant, sans doute à Paris, des études commencées sous de si brillants auspices, puisqu'il déclare de façon incidente qu'il a entendu (c'est-à-dire écouté) Pierre le Chantre.

Chronique an. 1107. Memini me audisse magistrum Petrum Cantorem Parisiensem, virum iustissimum atque doctissimum, referentem de abbate isto cisterciensi Stephano, quod cum quadam die ei nuntiatum esset a suo cellerario, nihil haberi in monasterio, unde vel uno die illa fratrum paucitas sustentari posset, respondit [etc.].¹⁶

[année 1107. Je me souviens d'avoir écouté Maître Pierre le Chantre de Paris, homme d'une très grande équité et extrêmement savant, qui racontait le fait suivant à propos de l'abbé cistercien Etienne : un jour, son cellerier était venu lui annoncer que le monastère n'avait plus aucune réserve, pas même de quoi nourrir pour une journée la pauvreté des frères ; alors Etienne répondit...]

On peut dès lors se demander à quoi sa famille destinait notre écrivain. L'ampleur de ses connaissances prouve un *cursus* scolaire longuement poursuivi, ainsi qu'une parfaite connaissance du latin dont use ce *litteratus* au style fleuri, de très bonnes connaissances scripturaires et littéraires de l'Antiquité, de Plutarque à Sénèque, sans oublier les poètes Ovide, Virgile, Lucain¹⁷ ... On ne peut s'empêcher de penser que ce *damoiseau* a des allures

¹⁵ *PL*, t. 212, p. 1035.

¹⁶ *PL*, t. 212, p. 1004-1005.

¹⁷ Tous sont des auteurs classiques que les clercs lettrés connaissaient bien et pratiquaient dans les écoles. Pour ce qui est de Plutarque, sa présence est due à l'*Institutio Trajani*, dont on sait que Jean de Salisbury l'avait enchâssée dans son *Policraticus* (voir la présentation en Introduction de C. BRUCKER, *Le Policratique de Jean de Salisbury*, tome V, Genève, Droz, 2006 : « ... ce miroir aux princes composé par Jean de Salisbury présente l'originalité d'intégrer ce que le Moyen Âge considérait comme le miroir des princes de Plutarque, l'*Institutio Trajani*, qui, indépendamment du problème épineux de la paternité et de l'origine du texte, partage l'esprit des traités politiques et moraux de Plutarque ». Le texte fut repris par Hélinand, puis par Vincent de Beauvais ; voir également M. KERNER, « Die *Institutio Trajani*, spätantike Lehrschrift oder hochmittelalterliche Fiktion ? », dans *Fälschungen im Mittelalter*, Teil I, Hanovre, Hahn, 1988, pp. 715-738.

de clerc, comme son oncle Ellebaud. Dans sa lettre à Gautier¹⁸, Hélinand reproche à son interlocuteur d'avoir renié ses vœux monastiques pour s'engager en d'autres projets, le mariage et la vie laïque. Nulle part Hélinand ne sous-entend qu'il a, pour sa part, renoncé à ce type d'existence. Était-il lui aussi destiné à une carrière dans la cléricature ? Était-il ou non l'aîné ? Enfin, nous n'avons pas de date précise pour son retrait à Froidmont. Suivant certains critiques, il avait « à peine vingt ans », suivant d'autres « trente-cinq ans »¹⁹...

Quoi qu'il en soit, la vie d'étudiant, cette *delicatissima vita*²⁰, le conquiert et il s'abandonna à tout ce qu'une fois devenu moine, il jugera sans concessions comme de graves turpitudes. Il était exceptionnellement doué, c'est ce qu'affirme Vincent de Beauvais²¹, en revanche le portrait liminaire donné par Migne :

Helinandus itaque, genere nobilis, ingenio acer, et promptus, facie venustus, corpore elegans et cunctis naturæ, fortunæque bonis adeo instructus ut nullus in Gallia prior, imo vix ei æqualis reperiretur. Sed admodum levis et inconstans fuit, denique monachus professus est apud Frigidum-Montem et ipse ita se depinguit sub nomine Guillemi ad Galterum scribens apud Vincentium Bellovacensem.²²

¹⁸ *Epistola Gualterum sive Liber de reparatione lapsi*, PL, t. 212, p. 745 sq.

¹⁹ Avant 1200 selon l'*HLF*, t. XVIII, mais comme on ignore la date de naissance d'Hélinand... Il y avait déjà au moins cinq ans qu'il était cistercien quand il écrivit les *Vers de la Mort*, on date ces derniers de 1194-1197. (F. WULFF et E. WALBERG, SATF, Paris, 1905, p. XV), partant, la date de naissance du poète se situerait entre 1154-1169 ou 1157-1172.

²⁰ C'est le terme employé par Hélinand pour introduire dans la lettre à Gautier le passage où l'ex-poète tourne en dérision sa jeunesse folâtre et trop sûre d'elle-même « Ut de me taceam quantos tibi possum ostendere qui de vita delicatissima ad hunc ordinem quem appellas durissimum se transtulerunt nec tamen adhuc ab eo resilierunt quamvis et ætate iuniores te sint et natura teneriores viribus et ut de tot millibus unum excipiam, unum tibi excipio qui certe solus ad omnium sufficit exemplum... » [Pour ne plus parler de moi, je puis te montrer un grand nombre de ceux qui, venant d'une vie remplie de délices, se sont tournés vers cet ordre que tu declares dur entre tous, sans pour autant que, jusqu'aujourd'hui, ils aient changé leur propos, eux qui étaient d'âge si tendre et d'une force naturellement encore fragile ; je ne t'en montrerai qu'un seul et unique parmi des milliers et des milliers, et celui-là sera au nom de tous un exemple suffisant.]

²¹ Dans la *Præfatio Vincenti Bellovacensis* qui ouvre les *Helinandi Frigidi Montis monachi Flores, a Vincentio Bellovacensi collecti* (PL, t. 212, p. 721) ; mais ce florilège a été composé par le Père B. TISSIER, *Bibliotheca Patr. Cisterciensis*, VII, et il se peut que la préface doive autant à ce religieux qu'à Vincent de Beauvais lui-même (texte : « His temporibus in territorio Belvacensi fuit Helinandus monachus Frigidimontis, vir religiosus et facundia disertus. » [En ces années vécut au territoire de Beauvais, Hélinand moine de Froidmont, un homme de foi et d'une belle éloquence...])

²² PL, t. 212, p. 477.

[Hélinand donc, de noble famille, d'une intelligence pénétrante et rapide, de belle figure, d'un corps plein d'élégance, était pourvu de tous les biens de la nature et de la fortune, au point qu'en France personne ne lui était supérieur, bien plus, on aurait peiné à trouver son égal. Mais il était d'une inconstance et d'une légèreté extraordinaires ; pour finir, il embrassa la vie monastique à Froidmont et, dans une lettre, que nous trouvons chez Vincent de Beauvais, où il se donne pour Guillaume écrivant à Gautier, il se dépeint lui-même sous les traits suivants...]

ne provient naturellement pas d'Hélinand lui-même. A vrai dire, il n'apparaît pas davantage dans le *Speculum Historiale*²³, sauf erreur. D'autre part, comme on retrouve exactement les mêmes termes chez Cesar Egasse du Boulay²⁴, l'origine en est très probablement Robert Bellarmin repris par Casimir Oudin, source de Migne.

On connaît les propos avec lesquels Hélinand évoque sa jeunesse dissipée dans *l'Epistola ad Gualterum* :

...ipse quidem spectaculum factus est et angelis et hominibus levitate miraculi qui prius eis spectaculum fuerat miraculo levitatis. Dum non scena, non circus, non theatrum, non amphitheatrum, non amphicircus, non forum, non platea, non gymnasium, non arena sine eo resonabat.²⁵

[Assurément lui même devint spectacle pour les anges comme pour les hommes, par la légèreté d'un miracle, alors que naguère il avait été à leurs yeux spectacle par sa miraculeuse légèreté, au temps où il n'existait pas une scène, pas une assemblée, pas un théâtre, pas un amphithéâtre, pas un cirque double, pas une place, pas un espace libre, pas un lieu de réunion, pas une arène pour retentir si ce n'était de son bruit.]

Nosti Helinandum, si quis novit hominem, si tamen hominem. Neque enim tam natus erat homo ad laborem quam avis ad volandum, circumiens terram et perambulans eam, quærens quem devoraret aut adulando aut objurgando. Ecce in claustro clausus est cui totus mundus solebat esse non solum quasi claustrum sed etiam carcer [...] Neque etenim ipse tam levis fuerat quam ipsa levitas. Unde et tanta levitas, tam leviter mutata apud plerosque nihil aliud putatur quam levitas...²⁶

[Vous avez sans doute ouï parler d'Hélinand, car qui n'a pas connu cet homme, si toutefois on peut l'appeler un homme ? Il n'était pas plus fait pour le travail que l'oiseau qui ne sait que voler, il n'avait d'autre occupation

²³ Consultable sur le site Gallica, *Speculum Historiale* dans l'édition *Speculi maioris Vincentii Burgundi praesulis bellovacensis, ordinis praedicatorum theologi ac doctoris eximii*, Tomus quartus, *Speculum historiale*, Duaci ex officina typographica Baltazaris Belleri sub circino aureo, 1624. On trouve le nom *Helinandus* p. 108.

²⁴ voir *infra*.

²⁵ *PL*, t. 212, p. 748

²⁶ *PL*, t. 212, p. 749.

que de courir le monde, cherchant à perdre les hommes, soit en les flattant, soit en les déchirant. Le voilà maintenant enfermé dans un cloître, lui à qui le monde entier semblait un cloître ou même une étroite prison. Il était si connu par son inconstance, que plusieurs attribuent à la légèreté le changement qui venait de s'opérer en lui... »²⁷]

Il semble que l'on puisse distinguer deux types de « fiche biographique » avant et jusqu'à la *Patrologie* de Migne : la première, fondée sur des auteurs religieux, principalement monastiques, va donner d'Hélinand de Froidmont, depuis le XVI^e jusqu'au XIX^e siècle, une présentation dont les termes sont quasi immuables et qui s'appuie largement sur Vincent de Beauvais, mais en s'enrichissant peu à peu de détails ; une seconde présentation, dont le bénédictin Michel-Jean-Joseph Brial (1743-1828) est un bon représentant dans le tome XVIII de l'*Histoire Littéraire de la France*, va ajouter à ces données très ecclésiastiques un supplément littéraire : outre l'admiration pour les *Vers de la Mort*, on voit alors Hélinand devenir un trouvère, chanter chez les seigneurs et tout particulièrement à la cour royale. Nous allons donc à présent vérifier brièvement ce qu'il en est de ces deux présentations d'Hélinand, sans néanmoins recenser de façon exhaustive toutes les étapes.

II – Pour donner un « état des lieux » de la présentation « religieuse », remontons le temps en opérant un choix parmi les auteurs autorisés (ceux qui, par là même, ont exercé une grande influence sur les collecteurs de renseignements) dont il est assez clair que chacun recopie, le plus souvent telles quelles, les informations de celui qui l'a précédé.

Tout d'abord la *Patrologia Latina* :

1) 1855 Jacques-Paul Migne, *PL* p. 202, présente Hélinand d'après Vincent de Beauvais, (*Speculum historiale*) et en se fondant de façon reconnue sur

2) 1638-1717 Casimir Oudin, prémontré de l'abbaye de Bucilly, *Supplementum de scriptoribus vel scriptis ecclesiasticis antiquis*, édition de 1686, pp. 483-484²⁸. Il s'agit en fait d'une reprise du *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*

²⁷ *HLF*, t. XVIII, la traduction citée ici est de Dom Brial et se trouve p. 88 et 89.

²⁸ Livre numérisé par Google : « Helinandus Frigidi-Montis ordinis cisterciensis in episcopatu bellovacensi monachus, claruit anno 1212. Scripsit *Chronicon* ad annum 1204 vel circiter, quod impressum novissime exat in *Bibliotheca veterum scriptorum ordinis cisterciensis* a Bertrando Tissier cum aliquibus ejusdem *sermonibus* erutis ex autographo dicti Helinandi, quem penes me olim habui e Frigido-Monte mutuatum, ac fideliter restitutum. Idem scripsit *Martyrium ss Gereonis ac sociorum ejus apud Surium ad diem 10 octobris*. Item prolixum *Commentarium in Apocalypsim B. Joannis* ex patribus compilatum, quem vidi ms. bis in bibliotheca Longipontis ordinis cisterciensis. Addo librum *De laude Vitæ claustralis* et alium *De regimine Principum* qui reperiuntur mss Tongris in bibliotheca canonicorum regularium.

(1613, pp. 414-415 et 620) de Robert Bellarmin, cardinal jésuite (1542-1621), version augmentée par Labbeus et Oudin ;

3) 1656 -1756 *Gallia Christiana* des frères de Sainte-Marthe²⁹ ;

4) 1596-1666 Charles de Visch, cistercien, prieur et bibliothécaire de l'abbaye des Dunes en Flandre, *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* (1649), pp. 140-142, consacre une très longue notice à Hélinand où il reconnaît s'appuyer sur Bellarmin et Aubert le Mire³⁰, il dénie à Hélinand l'*Exordium magnum ordinis cisterciensis* et lui attribue les *Liber de laude vitae claustralis*, *De regimine Principum*, *De reparatione lapsi* (attribution disputée par Guillaume de Froidmont), *Sermones varii et Epistolae*, *Tractatus super illo Apollonis oraculo* « nosce teipsum ». De Visch signale aussi l'œuvre vernaculaire du moine de Froidmont :

[...] reperio Helinandum nostrum scripsisse quosdam versus gallicos de morte quae olim in Galliis passim solebant legi et cantari publice non sine magna utilitate.³¹

[Je trouve que notre Hélinand écrivit également certains vers en langue romane sur la mort, que jadis l'on avait accoutumé de lire et chanter en public dans la France, et cela, avec une grande utilité...]

Ejusdem *lib. de reparatione lapsi* ms. in bibliotheca Viridis-Vallis propre Bruxellas quem Vincentius Bellovacensis Helinando nostro contemporaneus eidem tribuit ; si tamen hic liber non est unus et idem cum libro *De laude Vita claustralis*, quod probabile satis est. Obiisse dicitur anno 1227. Fallitur Carolus de Visch in *Bibliotheca Scriptorum cisterciensis ordinis*, dum duos Helinandos, alium e Frigido Monte, alium e Persennia distinguit : est enim unicus horum omnium scriptor operum.

²⁹ Livre numérisé par Google dans l'édition complétée et révisée de DENIS DE SAINTE-MARTHE, *Gallia christiana in provincias ecclesiasticas distributa*, tome IX, *De provincia remensi eiusque metropoli ac suffraganeis suessionensi, laudunensi, bellovacensi, catalaunensi ac noviomensi ecclesiis*, Paris, 1756, p. 831 : « sub eo [abbate Frigidimontis] Helinandus monachus scripsit. » voir aussi O. PONCET, « La Gallia christiana (1356) des frères de Sainte-Marthe : une entreprise gallicane ? », *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 3, 2009 (texte intégral en libre accès depuis le 1er juillet 2012 sur revue.org).

³⁰ Helinandus [...] scripsit *Chronicon* amplum et praeclarum ab exordio mundi usque ad sua tempora, hoc est 1212 in 48 libros distributum : ex quo opere multa hauserunt Sanctus Antoninus, et Vincentius Belvacensis ut recte notarunt Bellarminus et Aubertus Miraeus.

³¹ Tout de suite après ces lignes, de Visch passe à l'ouvrage de Loisel qu'il a lu, pour un petit *addendum* où il parle de la *vita dissoluta* du poète Hélinand et évoque ses amis, tous des ecclésiastiques, mais il ne cite pas parmi eux le roi Philippe Auguste et se garde bien de donner un seul vers en langue romane. Il reprend cependant à Loisel son appréciation sur le style d'Hélinand : « Testatur Helinandi stylum ubique esse ornatum valde, et figuratum, orationem plenam, sententiosam et moralem, rythmos vero eiusdam eruditos et fluidos ut nullis antiquis aut modernis quidquam debeant ». [Il atteste que l'écriture d'Hélinand est en tout endroit des plus ornées et remplie de figures de style, son discours est abondant, d'une grande richesse pour ses idées et sa morale, ses vers sont fluides et très savants au point de ne le céder en rien aux antiques comme aux modernes.]

5) 1577-1649 Gerardus Jan Vossius (Voss), universitaire néerlandais, professeur d'histoire, philosophie, grammaire et théologie, *De historicis latinis* (en trois livres), lib. II, p. 441³², (1627 avec distinction erronée entre deux « Hélinand », qui a été dénoncée par Bellarmin) ;

6) 1534-1611 Antonius Possevinus, jésuite italien, *Apparatus sacer* 1608, I, p. 721³³ ;

7) milieu XVI^e siècle, † en 1642, (alors qu'il était octogénaire), Jean d'Assignies, cistercien de Cambron, puis de Nizelles. *Vies des personnages illustres en sainteté en l'ordre de Cîteaux*, II (2 vol., 1598 et 1606)³⁴.

8) 1530-1576 Josias Simlerus (Simmler), pasteur Suisse, professeur d'exégèse, *Bibliotheca instituta et collecta primum a Conrado Gesnero*, Tiguri, (1574) recopie

9) 1516-1565 Conrad Gesner, humaniste suisse naturaliste et biographe (entre autres), *Bibliotheca universalis sive catalogus omnium scriptorum* (1545)³⁵.

10) 1462-1516 Johannes Trithemius (Trithème), bénédictin à Sponheim (diocèse de Mayence), *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis Catalogus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum* (1494)³⁶ :

³² Gerardi Joannis VOSSI, *De historicis latinis* libri III, version numérique sur Google Books ou archive.org : « Elymandus seu Elimandus, Frigidi-Montis monachus, in agro Beluacensi claruit temporibus Henrici VI ac *Chronicon* contexuit libris XLVIII, quibus omne ævum ab orbe condito ad sua usque tempora complexus fuit. Alia quoque ejusdem commemorat Jac. Phil. Bergomas. *Chr. Suppl. lib. XII ad an. 1499*. Multa ex hoc Elimando adscripto auctoris nomine, referuntur in magno isto chronico belgico cujus canonicus regularis ordinis S. Augustini prope Nussiam auctor est. »

³³ Livre numérisé par Google : Anton. POSSEVINI Mantuani societ. Iesu, *Apparatus sacer ad scriptores veteris et novi Testamenti*, Cologne 1608, Antonio Possevino distingue un Hélinand(us monachus) et « Helmandus (sive forsan Helinandus dicitur) » : Helinandus gallus monachus Frigidi Montis congr. cluniacensis anno circiter 1200 scripsit *historiarum a creatione mundi lib.* 48 ; *de reparatione lapsi lib.* 1 ; *sermones* plures ; *epistolarum ad diversos lib.* 1. Vide Vincentium Bellovacensem in *Speculo historiali* lib 30, c. 108 et S. Antoninum in 3 par. *Chronicon* t. 18 c. 5. »

³⁴ Je n'ai pas eu accès à ce livre, mais Jean d'ASSIGNIES, *Cabinet des choses plus signalées advenues au sacré ordre de Cysteau, recueillies de divers livres tant écrits qu'imprimez et mises en langage vulgaire*, Douai, 1598, indique que l'une des ses sources les plus employées est le *Miroir des histoires* de Vincent de Beauvais.

³⁵ Livre numérique consultable sur le site de la Zentralbibliothek Zürich : « Helinandus monachus Frigidi Montis scripsit ab exordio mundi ad suam usque aetatem *historiarum libros* 48, *de reparatione lapsi lib.* 1, *Sermones* plures lib.1, *epistolarum lib.* 1 Claruit anno Domini 1069 », p. 270.

³⁶ *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, livre numérisé sous le nom *Catalogus Scriptorum ecclesiasticorum sive illustrium virorum cum appendice eorum qui nostro etiam seculo doctissimi claruere*, per venerabilem virum dominum Iohannem a TRITTENHEM abbatem spanhemensem disertissime conscriptus, édition de Cologne, 1531, p. 80.

Helmandus, monachus Frigidimontis, vir in divinis scripturis longa exercitatione studiosus et eruditus atque in secularibus litteris nobiliter doctus, ingenio acutus et disertus eloquio, propter doctrinæ excellentiam et vite integritatem inter ecclesiasticos doctores sui temporis non ultimus apparuit. Scripsit enim plura opuscula quibus nomen suum immortalitati donavit. E quibus feruntur 5 subjecta. Ab exordio mundi usque ad suam aetatem, magnum et insigne *volumen Historiarum* (libri 48); *De reparatione lapsi* (lib 1); *Sermones plures* (lib. I); *Lamentationes et ve*; *Epistularum ad diversos lib[er] I*. Et alia plura. Claruit sub Henrico sexto. Anno divini MCC.

[Hélinand, moine de Froidmont, que sa longue et studieuse pratique des divines Écritures avait rendu très savant, homme fort instruit aussi dans les Lettres de ce monde, d'une intelligence pénétrante et d'une belle éloquence, en raison de ses excellentes connaissances et de la pureté de sa vie, ne sembla pas le dernier parmi les savants religieux de son époque. Car il écrivit de nombreux petits ouvrages qui doivent leur immortalité à son nom. Parmi lesquels on en note 5, le grand et remarquable *Livre des histoires* (en 48 livres), de l'origine du monde à son temps; *Expiation de la faute* (en un livre), Plusieurs *sermons* (un livre); *Lamentations et malheurs*; *Lettres* à différents destinataires (un livre) et un certain nombre d'autres ouvrages. Hélinand brilla sous Henri VI en l'an du Seigneur 1200.]

11) 1434-1520 Jacques-Philippe Foresti, dit Philippe de Bergame, Augustin, Chronique de 1485³⁷ a été utilisé par Trithème. Foresti semble représenter le « point zéro » des livres imprimés³⁸:

Helymandus Frigidimontis monachus his temporibus in Galliis in agro Belvacensi religione et doctrina clarus effulsit. Qui cum esset vir doctissimus diligenti cura de omnibus rebus gestis Chronicas perpulchras ab initio mundi usque ad hec tempora composuit. [sec. XII, 1199]

[Hélymand, moine de Froidmont, en ces mêmes années dans le territoire de Beauvais, brilla et fut illustre par sa religion et son savoir. Il fut un homme aux très grandes connaissances qui composa avec soin et diligence une magnifique Chronique de toutes les actions advenues du début de ce monde jusqu'à son époque.]

A présent en ce qui concerne la présentation d'Hélinand avec notice sur l'œuvre littéraire :

³⁷ Selon P. BAYLE, « Bergame », dans *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, éditions de 1730 et 1740, t. I.

³⁸ J.-P. FORESTI DE BERGAME, *Supplementum chronicarum orbis ab initio mundi*, Venise, 1485, p. 271.

A. 1655-1673 César Egasse du Boulay, *Catalogus Universitatis Pariensis*³⁹, édition de 1722 (texte en latin, citation du *Roman d'Alexandre* en ancien français « retouché ») tome II, p. 746 :

Helinandus, genere nobilis, ingenio acer et promptus, facie venustus, corpore elegans, et cunctis naturæ fortunæque bonis adeo instructus, ut nullus illo in Gallia prior, imo vix ei aequalis reperiretur, sed admodum levis et inconstans fuit. [...] argumentum. Idem Vincentius an. 1208 : « His temporibus.... per diversa loca inferni. »

Vient ensuite la citation de Trithemius :

Trithemius ait eum in divinis Scripturis longa exercitatione studiosum et eruditum fuisse atque in secularibus litteris nobiliter doctum, ingenio acutum et disertum eloquio propter doctrinæ excellentiam et vitæ integritatem inter ecclesiasticos doctores sui temporis non ultimum apparuisse. Scripsit *historiam ab orbe condito ad an. 1210* libris 48 cuius meminerunt Vincentius, Antoninus, Trithemius, etc. Gesnerus ait eum claruisse an. 1069 sed male. Scripsit etiam *De reparatione lapsi*, l(ib.) I, *Sermonum* L. *Epistolarum* lib.I. Excelluit etiam poesi Gallica et poema de *Morte* lingua vernacula composuit, ut ex Vincentio supra retulimus.

Puis :

Tam suaviter autem canebat ut eum Rex suae mensæ accumbere juberet, uti discimus ex his versibus rythmicis :

[Il chantait de façon si agréable que le roi ordonnait qu'il vînt à ses repas, comme nous l'apprenons de ces vers rythmiques]

Quant ly Roy ot mangié, s'appella Hélinand
Pour ly esbanoyer, commanda que il chant.
Cil commence a noter ainsi con ly Iayant
Monter voldrent au Ciel comme gent mescreant.
Entre les Diex y ot une bataille grant
Si ne fust Iuppiter a sa foudre bruyant
Qui tous les descocha, ia ne eussent garent.

Acceptissimus fuit Philippo Augusto. Obiisse vero creditur circa an. 1212.

[Il fut particulièrement apprécié de Philippe Auguste. On croit que sa mort est datée des années 1212.]

Il faut noter que Du Boulay juge bon de revenir sur ces lignes dans son Tome III (*ab anno 1200 ad an. 1300*) avec une notice plus étoffée sous la date de 1212 :

³⁹ Du Boulay emploie les mêmes formules que recopiera Migne d'après Casimir Oudin, cf. *supra*.

Eodem quoque anno fertur obiisse Elinandus Frigidi-Montis monachus quem sub Ludovico VII et Philippo Augusto floruisse constat. Nationis picardicæ fuit et natus in villa de Pruneroy agri Belvacensis. In divinis humanisque litteris excelluit sed maxime in arte versificatoria tam latina quam gallicana.⁴⁰

[Cette même année, dit-on, vit la mort de Hélinand, moine à Froidmont dont on a établi qu'il avait fleuri sous les rois Louis VII et Philippe Auguste ; il appartenait au pays picard, était né à Pruneroy, dans le territoire de Beauvais. Il excella dans les lettres divines comme humaines, mais surtout il fut un maître en vers aussi bien latins que romans.]

Suivent, outre un distique⁴¹, des citations des *Vers de la Mort* qui éclairent ce que Du Boulay entend par « vers en roman », une liste des amis du poète, tirée elle aussi des *Vers de la Mort* et utilisée comme document historique à la façon des *razos* occitanes.

B. 1643-1680 Louis Moreri, prêtre et érudit, *Le grand dictionnaire historique ou le mélange curieux de l'Histoire sacrée et profane*. (1731, dernière édition 1759, dictionnaire en « Français classique », traduit en allemand, anglais, espagnol, néerlandais, italien) :

Elimand ou Elinand, que d'autres nomment diversement Elimond et Hélinand, religieux de l'abbaye de Froimont de Cisteaux dans le diocèse de Beauvais, vivoit sur la fin du XII^e siècle, sous le règne de Philippe Auguste et l'empire de Henri VI. Il composa une chronique en XLVIII livres qui comprenoit ce qui est arrivé de plus remarquable depuis le commencement du monde, jusques en 1212. Le chanoine régulier de l'ordre de Saint Augustin, auteur de la *Grande Chronique de Flandre*, rapporte plusieurs choses de lui. Cette chronique n'est pas le seul ouvrage d'Elinand, il en avoit composé divers autres, comme *De laude vitæ claustrali*, *De reparatione lapsi*, *De regimine principum*, etc. On assure qu'il travailla à ce fécons traité depuis sa conversion.

Elinand avoit beaucoup d'esprit et il composoit des vers à la façon de son tems, ce qui le faisoit estimer dans la cour des Princes qui le voyaient avec plaisir. Ce qu'on remarque même dans le *Roman d'Alexandre* où il est parlé de lui en ces termes :

Quant ly Roys ot mangié, s'appella Hélinand

Pour ly esbanoyer, commanda que il chante...(etc.)

Elinand ne vivoit pas trop régulièrement à la cour. Il la quitta pour entrer dans l'ordre de Cisteaux où il mena une vie sainte et il mourut de même en 1233.

⁴⁰ DU BOULAY, p. 65.

⁴¹ Pauper, egenus, inops, pallens, exanguis, inanis
Æere, cibo, requie, frigore, peste, fame...

(On notera que Pierre Bayle, qui critique âprement la crédulité de Moreri, n'a pas estimé digne d'une entrée H/Elinand dans son Dictionnaire historique et critique.)

C. 1536-1631 Antoine Loisel, avocat au parlement de Paris, originaire de Beauvais, étudiant de Paris dans le *Collège des Prestres* sous Pierre la Ramée dit Ramus, puis de Toulouse, et en droit, sous Jacques Cujas, devint substitut au parlement de Paris; cet ami de Thou et de Pithou ainsi que du Président Fauchet rédigea en 1597 les *Mémoires des pays, villes, comté et comtes, évesché et évesques et pairrie, commune et personnes de renom de Beauvais et Beauvaisis*. Loisel en 1594 avait découvert un manuscrit des *Vers de la Mort* dont il procura une édition, d'ailleurs assez défectueuse. C'est probablement lui (dont Migne reconnaît qu'il s'est fondé sur ses écrits pour reconstruire la biographie d'Hélinand), qui a fait de l'écrivain des *Vers de la mort* un poète qui chantait régulièrement à la cour du roi Philippe Auguste. Loisel avait dû trouver chez le Président Fauchet la mention d'(H)élinand, chantant devant Alexandre. Sous la plume de Loisel, l'identité du jongleur et celle de l'auteur des *Vers de la Mort* est présentée comme une certitude.

Voici les termes d'Antoine Loisel⁴²:

X Je fis imprimer en l'an 1594 des vers en nostre ancien vulgaire François, composez par Dans Hélinand religieux, avec une lettre qui s'adressoit au feu sieur Fauchet premier président des monnoyes, contenant la Vie de l'Auteur, de laquelle on m'a conseillé inferer en ce recueil les principaux poincts pour montrer quel homme c'estoit que nostre Hélinand. [...] je veux[...] vous faire un brief recueil de ce que j'en ay peu apprendre.

Hélinand fu un Poëte, ou comme ils parloient lors, un chanterre du temps des rois Louys VII dict le Jeune, et Philippes Auguste: natif du pays de Beauvaisis, et comme ie croy à Pruneroy; instruit en toutes sortes de lettres seculieres et divines et singulierement en l'humanité et poësie tant Latine que François, selon ce qu'il se peut veoir par ce poëme et quelques vers latins qui se retrouvent encore aujourd'huy dont ce distique rapporté pourra servir de monstre:

Pauper, egenus, inops, pallens, exanguis, inanis,

Aere, cibo, requie, frigore, peste, fame.

Et semble qu'il pourroit avoir esté instruit en l'eschole de M. P. Abbaye-lard, d'autant que ses escripts s'en ressentent aucunement. En sa ieunesse il fut fort desbauché, courant et rodant le monde, suivant les cours des Princes, et maisons des grands, flattant les uns et mesdisant des autres, à la façon des ionglerrers et chanterres du temps: entre lesquels il gaigna facilement par son sçavoir le premier rang. Car un des autheurs du Roman d'Alexandre voulant

⁴² A. LOISEL, pp. 196-198.

ressusciter un autre Orphée ou Iöpas pour esgayer la compagnie apres le repas à la façon des plus anciens Grecs, Romains, Perses, bardes, Allemans et François, en parle ainsi :

Quant ly Roys ot mangié, s'appella Hélinand.
 Pour ly esbanoyer, commanda que il chant :
 Cil commence a noter ainsi con ly layant.
 Monter voldrent au Ciel comme gent mecreant.
 Entre les Diex y ot une bataille grand.
 Si ne fust Iupiter a sa foudre bruïant.
 Qui tos les dérocha, ja ne eussent garent.

Mais sa desbauche, legereté, folie et rage mondaine ne se sçauroient mieux représenter que par ce qu'il en escrit luy mesme au livre qu'il composa en faveur et sous le nom de Guillaume son frere et compaignon de religion, intitulé *De reparatione lapsi* : « Nosti, dict-il... »

S'appuyant alors sur les *Vers de la Mort*, Loisel en déduit les amitiés du poète, Philippe de Dreux évêque de Beauvais, Henri son frère, évêque d'Orléans, l'évêque de Noyon, le comte de Boulogne Renaut de Damartin, et il a cette conclusion fièrement révélatrice :

[...] ces vers me semblent si elegans que ie pense que nous ne ferons que bien si[...] nous luy rendons la vie après quatre cens ans tout entiers.⁴³

Jusqu'à plus ample informé, Loisel représente le « point zéro » de la citation du *Roman d'Alexandre* dont est tirée l'affirmation que le poète chanta devant le roi Philippe Auguste. Il nous faut désormais rechercher sur quels arguments cela peut (ou non) se fonder.

III – Antoine Loisel, nous venons de le constater, était féru de littérature médiévale. C'est la raison pour laquelle, découvrant dans le *Roman d'Alexandre* le prénom d'Elinant, il ne mit pas en doute un instant qu'il ne s'agît de l'auteur des *Vers de la Mort*⁴⁴. La citation en question se trouve dans la version d'Alexandre de Bernay dit aussi Alexandre de Paris, version dodécasyllabique qui allait devenir la *Vulgate* du *Roman*⁴⁵. D'Alexandre de

⁴³ A. LOISEL, p. 201.

⁴⁴ Il faudrait des recherches poussées pour vérifier la fréquence du prénom (H)Elinand dans les documents historiques. De Visch, op. cit., nomme un Hélinand de Perseigne et, à ce propos, discute les diverses formes du prénom *Helinandus*, *Elymandus*, *Helmundus*, forme choisie par Philippus Seguinus, cf. de Visch, p. 280. Un premier relevé sommaire dans les textes littéraires semble confirmer une relative rareté. (cf. A. MOISAN, *Répertoire des noms propres de personnes et de lieux cités dans les chansons de geste françaises et les œuvres étrangères dérivées*, Genève, Droz, 1986. L.-F. FLUTRE, *Table des noms propres avec toutes leurs variantes figurant dans les romans du Moyen Âge écrits en français ou en provençal et actuellement publiés ou analysés*, Paris-Genève, Droz 1962.)

⁴⁵ Alexandre de Paris, *Le Roman d'Alexandre*, traduction, présentation, notes de L. HARF-LANCNER, Le Livre de Poche, Lettres Gothiques, 1994. Le texte roman est celui édité par

Bernay, on sait peu de choses : il était normand d'origine et adopta le surnom de Paris pour y avoir fait ses études. Sa version de la célèbre geste du héros macédonien, qui est une véritable rhapsodie de tous les morceaux préexistants, est datée *circa* 1185⁴⁶. Le texte qui a attiré l'attention de Loisel se trouve vers la fin du *Roman*, laisse 348, v. 6017 sq. On ne discutera pas ici de l'authenticité (ou non authenticité) de la laisse en question et, pour plus de commodité, elle sera citée sous le nom d'« Alexandre de Bernay ».

Une précision lexicologique s'impose de prime abord. Quand on prête à Hélinand, le statut de *trouvère*, il faut considérer la source critique que l'on cite et l'époque où elle a été rédigée. En se référant aux termes en cours pendant le Moyen Âge, en ce qui concerne la lyrique, le terme *jongleur* désignait l'interprète plutôt que l'auteur d'une chanson. Le jongleur était le plus souvent de registres étendus, chantant de geste comme d'amour ou d'hagiographie. Le *ménéstrel* était proche du jongleur, en cela qu'on n'oubliait pas l'étymologie du mot, *ministerialis*, rappelant qu'il était *au service* d'un maître. Le *trouvère* était à la fois l'inventeur (*tropator/troverre*) en sa chanson de la musique et des paroles, et son interprète possible. Il est évident que le Président Fauchet, qui redécouvre, après des années de mépris, l'art musical de poètes bien oubliés emploie de façon assez vague les termes « trouverre/chanteur/jongleur »⁴⁷ ; le terme « trouvère » est celui qui va devenir commun aux XVII^e, XVIII^e et, encore, XIX^e siècles, « jongleur » évoquant désormais le joueur de tours divers, baladin, montreur d'ours, saltimbanque, selon l'image d'Épinal propre aux temps romantiques. Seront alors dits « trouvères » tous les écrivains du Moyen Âge⁴⁸. Ainsi sous la plume de Dom Brial, le « trouverre Hélinand »⁴⁹ peut-il être un clerc chantant en latin comme un chanteur en langue profane.

E. C. ARMSTRONG, *The medieval french Roman d'Alexandre*, Princeton, University Press, 1976, t. II.

⁴⁶ Selon L. Harf-Lancner, dernière éditrice du texte : « peu après 1180 », p. 21.

⁴⁷ Il est facile de s'en rendre compte en lisant le chap. VIII du *Recueil de l'origine de la langue et poésie française*, daté de 1581 (p. 72 sq.) : « [...] commencerent a se faire cognoistre les Trouverres et chanterres, conteours et iuglours [...] c'est a dire menestriers chantans avec la viole ; les uns desquels composoyent comme les Trouveurs ou Conteurs ; les autres chantoient les inventions d'autrui comme les chanterres et iugleours. Encores peut on dire que les Trouverres faisoient et inventoyent les rymes et les Conteours les proses : vous ayant dit ci devant qu'il y avoit roman rymé et roman sans ryme. Ces Trouveurs donc et Chantres ayans affaire l'un de l'autre s'accompagnoient volontiers [...] prenans leur subiect sus les faits des vaillans hommes (qu'ils appelloient Geste [...]), alloient comme i'ay dit par les cours resioiur les Princes, meslans quelque fois des fabliaux ... »

⁴⁸ J. Bédier parle encore du *trouvère* Turolde pour la *Chanson de Roland*. Le livre classique sur le jongleur est celui d'E. FARAL, *Les jongleurs en France au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Champion, 1964 [1910]. Ce sont ses définitions qui sont reprises ici : sur le jongleur et le trouvère, p. 76 ; sur le terme *ménéstrel* : p. 104 sq. Voir aussi S. MÉNÉGALDO, *Le jongleur dans la littérature narrative des XII^e et XIII^e siècles*, Paris, Champion, 2005.

⁴⁹ *HLF*, t. XVIII, p. 88.

En revanche, de nos jours, on distingue les deux catégories, réservant « trouvère » au compositeur de chansons en langue vernaculaire, et « ménestrel » à ces chanteurs de métier dont les Grands aimaient s'entourer, par exemple Adenet le Roi, « ménestrel » attitré des ducs de Flandre et de Brabant. Les « ménestrels » de ce type sont surtout documentés à partir de la seconde moitié du XIII^e siècle⁵⁰.

De ces précisions semble ressortir le fait évident qu'Elinant le chanteur du roi Alexandre, appartient à la catégorie des jongleurs, que plus tard on appellera « ménestrels ». Hélinand de Froidmont, si prompt à souligner sa noble origine, aurait difficilement accepté d'être appelé *jongleur*⁵¹, Laurence Harf-Lancner qui choisit précisément ce terme dans sa traduction souligne bien quel statut le texte prête au musicien ici « convoqué », qui fait partie des « bagages » du conquérant. Ainsi si l'on veut voir en Hélinand de Froidmont un *trouvère*, soit le personnage Elinant ne renvoie pas à lui, soit la référence semble quelque peu incongrue.

Quoi qu'il en soit de ce point de lexique, dans le passage en question, le roi Alexandre est occupé au siège de Babylone, peu de temps après avoir inventé le premier « aéroplane », une nacelle tirée par deux griffons, peu de temps aussi avant sa mort. Après un échange de paroles « sages et folles », le conquérant se retire dans sa tente, s'y restaure puis, en guise de préparation au sommeil, mande son jongleur favori pour le faire chanter. Le jongleur, habile à pénétrer les pensées et les humeurs du maître, choisit un texte approprié que voici dans la version du roman médiéval et la traduction de Laurence Harf-Lancner :

Qant li rois ot mengié, s'apela Elinant,
 Por lui esbanoier commande que il chant.
 Cil commence a noter ensi com li gaiant
 Vaurent monter el ciel comme gent
 mescreant,
 Entre les dieus en ot une bataille grant;
 Se ne fust Jupiter o sa foudre bruiant,
 Qui tous les desrocha, ja n'eüssent garant.
 Qant Alixandres l'ot, si respont en riant:
 « Qant li sires vaut, auques li home en
 sont vaillant. »
 III v. 6017 sq.

Après manger, le roi appelle Elinant,
Et lui ordonne de chanter pour le divertir.
Elinant se met à chanter l'histoire des
géants
qui voulurent en vrais mécréants monter
jusqu'au ciel.
Il y eut grande bataille parmi les dieux.
Sans Jupiter et sa bruyante foudre,
Qui les précipita du haut des rochers, les
dieux étaient tous perdus.
Entendant cela, Alexandre éclata de rire
et dit :
« Quand le maître a de la valeur, ses
hommes aussi ! »

⁵⁰ Dans le *Roman de Guillaume de Dole*, écrit par Jean Renart qui fut peut-être un jongleur, l'auteur glorifie ce genre d'amuseur en en faisant un personnage admirable et lui donne le nom transparent de « Jouglet », avec son sémantisme si riche.

⁵¹ Cela n'empêche nullement le mépris que sous-tend le terme *histrio* dans la bouche de religieux qui condamnent les errements du spectacle, davantage encore lorsque leur

Voir dans cet Elinant « notre » Hélinand sous-entend un certain nombre de choses dont toutes sont problématiques. Il y a d'abord le problème des dates : si vraiment Hélinand s'est fait moine en 1182⁵², il n'est pas sûr que le *Roman d'Alexandre* en question ait déjà été terminé et connu. Il faut ensuite supposer qu'« Alexandre de Bernay » connaissait si bien Hélinand comme « trouvère » qu'il lui aurait ici adressé un petit salut admiratif ; mais il aurait ignoré sa conversion. De toutes façons, le texte choisi, la lutte de Jupiter contre les Titans, n'appartient pas au registre des jongleurs ni des trouvères lyriques, sauf à l'imaginer chanté en latin, et nous avons alors un poète de type goliard. Mais, comme on l'a depuis longtemps établi, le choix de cet épisode mythologique, d'où qu'il vienne, a de tout autres implications.

C'est une allusion intertextuelle, car la lutte des Titans fait partie du registre des romans antiques, on la trouve dans le *Roman de Thèbes* et dans le *Roman d'Enéas*. Nous sommes donc renvoyés à la « vérité » propre au roman antique. Ensuite surtout, la lutte des Titans est reliée à la guerre devant Babylone, et Alexandre, après avoir violé de sa *curiositas* néfaste et les fonds de l'Océan et les hauteurs du ciel, vient de clamer haut et fort sa volonté de faire sienne la tour de Babel, érigée pour la plus folle vanité des hommes. Tout ce passage qui prépare à la fin misérable du héros est donc conçu pour amplifier l'ὄβρις du Macédonien qui va consommer sa perte. Que le moine de Froidmont ait partagé un tel regard critique sur l'orgueil humain, c'est indéniable, en témoigne l'allusion à Alexandre dans son sermon sur la fête des Rameaux :

Alii [Il s'agit des prélats] nec ipsos palefridos suaviter ambulantes sua sessione dignos existimant, nisi [...] repræsentent Bucephalos, ostantes videlicet nobilitatem generis ut quasi Alexandrino sanguine respersi videantur. (*PL* p. 557, Sermo IX, *In ramis palmarum* II).

[D'autres ne jugent même pas dignes de leur siège leurs palefrois à la douce allure, s'ils n'ont pas l'air de bucéphales [...] sans doute pour montrer la

propre jeunesse n'a pas été aussi sévère à ce sujet. Le sémantisme médiéval de *jongleur* incluait déjà le sens péjoratif qui triomphera dans les acceptions plus récentes, c'est surtout sur le rapport clerc et jongleur, tous deux grands usagers de la parole, qu'ont porté les travaux plus récents, on se référera à C. CASAGRANDE et S. VECCHIO, « Clercs et jongleurs dans la société médiévale (XII-XIII^e siècles, », *Annales, Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations*, t. 5, 1979, pp. 913-928, et aux pages particulièrement éclairantes de M. CLOUZOT, « Un intermédiaire culturel au XIII^e siècle, le jongleur », *Signum*, Revista da Abrem, Associação Brasileira de Estudos Medievais, n°7, 2005, pp. 63-98.

⁵² C'est la date proposée par G. TYL-LABORY dans le *Dictionnaire des Lettres françaises Le Moyen Âge* – ed. G. HASENOHR – M. ZINK, La pochothèque, Paris, Fayard, 1992. La fourchette communément admise est 1180/1185.

noblesse de leur race comme s'ils semblaient tout éclaboussés du sang d'Alexandre.]

Que le joyeux drille qu'était Hélinand avant sa conversion ait jugé de la même façon le magnifique Alexandre, c'est beaucoup moins sûr.

IV – Hélinand, nous l'avons vu, trace de sa carrière de poète une image parfaitement hyperbolique : à le croire, sa réputation était immense. Or il ne nous en reste rien. Même si l'argument *a silentio* doit toujours être manié avec précaution, c'est cependant un indice. Et cela nous pousse à voir son bel élan oratoire pour ce qu'il est, une *amplificatio*. Il semble bien qu'elle renvoie à un texte extrêmement connu, qui est la *Vie* du Père égyptien Arsène⁵³. De tous les ermites de Thébaidé, Arsène était le seul à être distingué à Clairvaux où il avait son autel propre et les anachorètes du désert étaient le modèle même des cisterciens⁵⁴. Dans l'apophtegme en question, Arsène reçoit la visite d'un moine d'Egypte qui, venu le voir dans un but d'édification, est fort dépité de lui découvrir quelques menus accommodements avec l'ascèse. Arsène, qui a bien pénétré ses sentiments, lui démontre alors que, misérable fellah des bords du Nil qu'il était, le moine a quitté sa vie de pauvre pour une existence monastique en tout point plus confortable ; Arsène, quant à lui, courtisan chéri de Théodose, a abandonné l'existence la plus délicieuse pour un ermitage qui, même un peu amélioré, ne cesse de lui paraître épouvantable. De même pour Hélinand : « De si haut si bas », dit le proverbe contemporain !

Et même sans *amplificatio*, le succès d'Hélinand aurait-il franchi les limites des comtés de Beauvais et de Champagne, voire celles de Paris, jusqu'à atteindre la Normandie, en ces années fort hostile au Royaume, alors que tout laisse entendre qu'il ne chanta pas durant très longtemps ?

Enfin, il y a l'interlocuteur du jongleur, Alexandre lui-même. L'égaliser à Philippe Auguste et par là conclure à l'identité d'Elinand et du futur moine, c'est tout de même aller un peu vite. Même si Philippe Auguste avait une forte admiration pour le conquérant antique, ainsi que l'a bien montré John Baldwin⁵⁵, néanmoins il est tout aussi vrai que ce roi, comme le rapporte Rigord, n'avait pas la moindre sympathie pour les trouvères ni

⁵³ Dom L. REGNAULT (éditeur scientifique), *Les sentences des Pères du désert, traduits du grec, du latin et du copte*, Abbaye Saint-Pierre de Solesmes, 1976-1985, t. V, abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1985 ; n°76, p. 153 (*la discrétion*), pour le texte latin, voir H. Rosweyde, *Vitas Patrum*, Anvers, 1605 (repris tel quel dans la *Patrologie* de Migne).

⁵⁴ H. D'ARBOIS DE JUBAINVILLE, *Étude sur l'état intérieur des abbayes cisterciennes et principalement de Clairvaux aux XIIe et XIIIe siècles*, Paris, Durand, 1858, reprints New-York, 1976, p. 39.

⁵⁵ J. BALDWIN, *Philippe Auguste et son gouvernement, les fondations du pouvoir royal en France au Moyen Âge*, Paris, Fayard, 1991. (voir pp. 461-462 et 483-484).

les jongleurs : un jour, voyant un groupe de ces derniers parés de vêtements qu'ils avaient reçus pour leur prestation devant les cours seigneuriales, le roi donna l'ordre que dans son palais, on ne reçût plus les jongleurs et qu'on distribuât les vêtements aux pauvres qui, eux, en avaient besoin⁵⁶. Aussi les trouvères ne citent-ils pas souvent le Capétien ! On trouve bien un troubadour pour l'évoquer, mais c'est pour le traiter de pingre et de lâche, il s'agit de Peire Vidal, et le troubadour ne porte pas ces critiques sous le coup d'un mouvement d'humeur, il y revient en 1187, 1193, 1196, 1201 !

On se rappellera, pour en finir avec ce point, l'*exemplum* où Philippe Auguste est mis en scène⁵⁷. Il déclare au jongleur Hugues le Noir qu'à l'époque où ils vivent, on ne trouve plus de Roland ni d'Olivier ; certes, lui réplique le jongleur, mais il faut dire aussi qu'on ne trouve plus de Charlemagne. Voilà qui en dit plus qu'un long discours sur l'opinion que les trouvères se faisaient du roi de France.

La conséquence de tous ces faits avérés est que les historiens de la littérature qui se sont intéressés au mécénat en cette fin XII^e siècle et au début du XIII^e reconnaissent unanimement que la cour royale française se tient à l'écart de la lyrique au rebours de celle des Anglo-Normands⁵⁸. Et, malgré le petit cénacle formé autour de Louis VIII et Blanche de Castille avant la mort de Philippe Auguste, il en sera ainsi jusqu'à la disparition de saint Louis. Seuls, l'Histoire et les textes pieux étaient admis. On ne sache pas que les Titans aient fait partie de l'un ou l'autre registre.

Pour faire le tour de la question, il faut cependant parler d'une exception, exactement datable de ces années-là.

Nous sommes bien à la cour royale, à Paris, entre 1179 et 1180⁵⁹. Le jeune roi, qui a à peine quinze ans, est encore sous la coupe du « parti champenois », représenté par sa mère, Adèle de Champagne, et son oncle, Guillaume de Champagne dit aux-Blanches-Mains, archevêque de Reims. Mais l'adolescent, qui ne désire rien tant que se libérer de l'emprise champenoise en négociant un mariage avec l'héritière de l'Artois, Isabelle de Hainaut, souffle le froid et le chaud entre Flandre et Champagne. En 1180, il épouse Isabelle, âgée de dix ans, avant de se brouiller, l'année suivante, avec son parrain, le comte Philippe de Flandres. C'est précisément quand meurt le vieux roi Louis VII, paralysé depuis déjà quelques mois, entre l'accès au

⁵⁶ R.-H. BAUTIER date cette décision de 1187, « La personnalité de Philippe-Auguste », *La France de Philippe Auguste, le temps des mutations*, Paris, CNRS, 1982, pp. 33-57, (voir p. 45).

⁵⁷ J. LE GOFF, « Philippe Auguste dans les *exempla* », *ibidem*, pp. 145-154 (citation p. 151).

⁵⁸ Le roi Richard Cœur de Lion lui-même composait des chansons d'oïl et d'oc et était en relations avec de célèbres troubadours.

⁵⁹ Y. LEFÈVRE, « L'image de Philippe Auguste chez les poètes », *ibidem*, pp. 133-144.

trône de Philippe Auguste, et son mariage, qu'un trouvère, destiné à devenir l'un des plus célèbres, mais alors fort jeune encore, le bouillant Conon de Béthune, vint interpréter un *son d'amour* devant la cour réunie. Conon n'avait pas prévu que la situation politique allait interférer dans le jugement critique sur son art. Il était en effet le cousin de Baudouin de Hainaut, frère de la future petite reine. Au moment où le nouveau roi semblait se tourner vers le parti flamand, c'était trop demander aux Champenois présents de se montrer aimables envers un ennemi ; Conon, qui possédait un très mauvais caractère, en tira des vers vengeurs⁶⁰ :

I Mout me semont Amors ke je m'envoise
Quant je plus doi de chanter estre cois.
Mais j'ai plus grant talent ke je me coise,
Por çou s'ai mis mon chanter en defois
Ke mon langaige ont blasmé li François
Et mes cançons, oiant les Champenois
Et la Contesse encoir, dont plus me poise

Amour m'invite à l'allégresse
Quand je devrais plutôt rester silencieux ;
Mais je préfère de beaucoup me taire :
Aussi ai-je renoncé à chanter,
Car les Français ont blâmé mon langage
Et mes chansons, devant les Champenois
Et la comtesse aussi, ce qui me chagrine
le plus.

II La roïne n'a pas fait ke cortoise,
Ki me reprist, ele et ses fieus, li Rois.
Encoir ne soit ma parole franchoise,
Si la puet on bien entendre en franchois.
Ne chil ne sont bien apris ne cortois
S'il m'ont repris se j'ai dit mos d'Artois,
Car je ne fui pas norris a Pontoise !

La Reine ne s'est pas montrée courtoise,
En me reprenant, elle et son fils le Roi,
Même si je ne suis pas de langue française,
On peut bien me comprendre en français.
Ces gens ne sont pas bien élevés ni courtois,
Qui m'ont blâmé pour mon parler d'Artois :
Moi, je n'ai pas été élevé à Pontoise !

Ce texte, outre les arrière-plans politiques qu'il met en évidence, montre bien ce qu'il en était : il fallut qu'à la cour royale résidât encore la reine mère, Adèle de Champagne, et que ce fût par un jour où était venue lui rendre visite sa belle-sœur, la fameuse Marie de Champagne, pour qu'un trouvère y chantât d'amour, un trouvère d'ailleurs présent parce qu'il était l'un des compagnons du négociateur du mariage, le comte Baudouin de Hainaut. Et c'est bien l'avis critique des Champenois qui ulcère le poète, le roi – simple « fils de la reine » – a manqué à sa tâche de médiateur courtois entre les adversaires, alors qu'il était la cause réelle du litige.

Conon de Béthune est le seul trouvère qui ait chanté à la cour royale, si l'on en croit l'Histoire ; après lui, il faudra attendre 1213 pour voir passer

⁶⁰ *Les Chansons de Conon de Béthune* – ed. A. WALLENSKÖLD, Paris, Champion, 1968, chanson III, p. 5 ; Traduction de J. DUFOURNET, *Les Chansons de langue d'oïl, l'art des trouvères* – ed. M.-G. GROSSEL – J.-C. HERBIN, Presses de l'Université de Valenciennes, 2008, p. 73.

à la cour de Mantes, devant Blanche de Castille, le grand trouvère Gace Brulé.

Pour conclure, il se peut que des liens d'amitié aient uni le roi et Hélinand, futur moine de Froidmont. Mais ce n'est pas dans le *Roman d'Alexandre* qu'on trouvera la preuve qu'Alexandre de Bernay a choisi le prénom Hélinand pour saluer un confrère en l'*art du trouver* ni que, du temps où il exerçait son art, Hélinand chantait ses vers à la cour du roi. Nous ne quittons nulle part le domaine de l'hypothèse.

V – Reste à déterminer ce qu'était la poésie lyrique d'Hélinand ... Tâche bien difficile puisqu'il n'en reste rien. Il nous faut donc retourner au texte même de la *Chronique* :

Dum non scena, non circus, non theatrum, non amphitheatrum, non amphicircus, non forum, non platea, non gymnasium, non arena sine eo resonabat.

Ce n'est pas sans plaisir qu'on lit les traductions qu'ont données de ces quelques lignes les érudits du temps passé. On parlera de « la cour des princes » (Moreri) ou des « châteaux, écoles, tournois, places publiques » (Brial) pour désigner les lieux où se produisit Hélinand. Monique Santucci écrira pour sa part « sur les scènes des théâtres, sur les places publiques, dans les écoles et, bien sûr, à la cour ». Mais si, plus modestement on s'en réfère au *Glossarium* de Du Cange, on peut constater que la presque totalité de ces termes renvoie à un passé daté. Un des érudits de jadis dut éprouver la même impression, car il emploie pour qualifier Hélinand le terme de *citharède* !

Voyons donc les termes que le cistercien a choisis : *scena* a un sens assez proche du latin classique, la difficulté étant de savoir ce que cela pouvait représenter vers 1195, à une époque où le théâtre est encore en grande partie soit joué dans les églises (les *ludi* autour du *Quem quaeritis* et même le *Jeu d'Adam*), soit interprété sur des textes classiques, mais à l'intérieur des édifices religieux (écoles, monastères, on pense à Hroswitha ou au *Jeu de Daniel*) ; la première pièce, semi-profane (le *Jeu de saint Nicolas* de Jehan Bodel, remarquable précurseur) est datée *circa* 1200 ; posons donc la définition de Papias :

Scena est camera quæ ombumbrat locum in theatro.[...] scena domus in theatro erat structa cum pulpito quæ orchestra vocabatur ubi cantabant comici, tragici atque saltabant histriones et mimi.⁶¹

[La scène est une chambre qui cache un endroit dans le théâtre, sur le théâtre la scène était construite avec une estrade/un tréteau qui portait le

⁶¹ *Papias vocabulista* – ed. De Pincis, Venise, 1496, reproduction Gallica, p. 307. Ce texte renvoie à Isidore de Séville et sera repris par UGGUCIO DA PISA, *Derivationes* – ed. E. CECCHINI – G. ARBIZZONI – *et alii*, Tavarnuzze, Firenze 2004.

nom d'orchestre où chantaient les acteurs comiques et tragiques et où histrions et mimes gesticulaient.]

Si *circus* signifie *assemblée* (entrée 1 de Du Cange), on peut imaginer qu'un trouvère y chante, encore que cette *assemblée* ait un sens très religieux à se référer à l'exemple d'Hugues de Flavigny⁶². Trois mots tournent autour de l'idée de « place publique », ce sont *forum* – que Du Cange définit comme *feriae, nundinae, foires* ; *platea*, définie comme *locus vacuus, ager incultus* – ; et *theatrum*, défini comme *forum, locus publicus* ; *gymnasium* est plus délicat à analyser, il est d'abord glosé comme *monasterium*, mais c'est dans l'épithaphe d'un abbé du Mont-Cassin ou dans la *Vie de ste Rictrude* (*gymnasium monasteriale*) ; plus intéressante, une définition renvoyant à ces *ludis literariis* « in quo pueri litteris et liberalibus disciplinis exercentur », mais dans une citation ancienne, d'Ambroise de Milan. Les trois derniers, *arena, amphitheatrum* et *amphicircus* renvoient tous à la réalité antique de l'amphithéâtre avec des occurrences venues des *Vies* des martyrs, *arena* étant une métonymie d'*amphitheatrum* ; quant à *amphicircus*, le seul renvoi du *Glossarium* est précisément l'occurrence d'Hélinand sur laquelle nous nous penchons, ce qui donnerait à penser qu'il s'agit d'un hapax.

Il est clair que le passage veut simplement dire : on entendait vraiment partout cet universel Hélinand ! Mais notre moine a recours à des termes assez étranges, ils donnent soit l'impression que nous sommes en face d'un jongleur (qui se produit dans les foires ou les écarts déserts, peut-être où l'on allait danser ?) soit que la réalité à laquelle on nous renvoie est caduque : Antiquité doublement rejetée, car ante-chrétienne et ici réservée aux prestations d'une sorte d'histrion qu'on ne saurait admirer.

Il est fort tentant d'y voir de l'humour. Hélinand s'amuse ! Et ce qui ressort de cette énumération plutôt burlesque, c'est le total mépris dans lequel il faut tenir ce jongleur agité à la voix tonitruante. Se dire une « star » en employant ce genre de termes confine à l'autodérision et va de pair avec la rupture opérée par la conversion. On n'aura garde d'ignorer en ces lignes la brillante rhétorique sur les ailes, qu'elles soient d'ange ou d'oiseau, autour de la notion de *levitas*, elle-même réitérée, quand on se souvient que les *Bestiaires*⁶³ condamnent précisément en l'oiseau cette « légèreté » dont il est le symbole, d'ailleurs féminin. On comprend en ce sens tout ce qu'enferme la restriction introduite par le *Tamen* :

⁶² Circus: circulus, consessus. Hugo Flaviniencensis in Chronico ann. 1100 « Judicio Concilii ad primam Abbatis Divionensis, vocem de Abbatia investitus, astantibus Canonicis Eduensibus et laudentibus, cappa et baculo donatus, in CIRCO residere jussus, post soluto Concilio, ad propria sum remissus. »

⁶³ Rappelons que Pierre de Beauvais composa des *Bestiaires* pour l'ami d'Hélinand, Philippe de Dreux ; on peut supposer qu'Hélinand en prit connaissance.

Nosti Helinandum, si quis novit hominem, *si tamen hominem*.

On pense à Folquet de Marseille s'infligeant de dures macérations lorsque, devenu évêque, il entendait quelqu'un fredonner une chanson qu'il avait composée dans son passé de troubadour.

La suite paraît moins ironique et plus révélatrice :

Neque enim tam natus erat homo ad laborem quam avis ad volandum⁶⁴, circumiens terram et perambulans eam, quaerens quem devoraret⁶⁵ aut adulando aut objurgando.

[Il n'était pas plus fait pour le travail que l'oiseau qui ne sait que voler, il n'avait d'autre occupation que de courir le monde, cherchant quelqu'un à dévorer, soit en le flattant, soit en le déchirant.]

S'il faut vraiment en croire les mots employés, outre l'impression que le poète se déplaçait beaucoup, malheureusement invérifiable, ce sont les deux gérondifs qui nous arrêteront. Nul doute qu'en reliant ces deux instrumentaux au même *devoraret* qui transforme le trouvère en double du « lion dévorant » de l'Écriture, Hélinand ne fait que réaffirmer son total rejet de l'activité poétique, proprement devenue démoniaque.

Mais, pour le spécialiste de la lyrique de cette fin du XII^e siècle, il est nécessaire là encore de se montrer particulièrement attentif aux mots utilisés. *Objurgando* est sans conteste un terme qui renvoie au domaine de la satire. *Adulando* est plus ambigu : s'agit-il de flatterie ou d'une métaphore référant à la *Fine Amour* ? La question est très importante : si Hélinand détruisait les âmes « en flattant et en critiquant », il appartient véritablement au registre de la poésie latine, on pense à son contemporain exact et bien connu, Gautier de Châtillon, dont la veine mordante est célèbre, on en revient à l'Elinant du *Roman d'Alexandre*, chantant devant son maître⁶⁶.

Si en revanche, l'adulation se porte sur la dame, Hélinand peut se muer en poète de la lyrique romane, ce qu'aujourd'hui nous appelons précisément « trouvère ». Mais le recours au dictionnaire montre que les termes *aduleor/adulacion* au sens de « flatterie » sont très rares dans les textes du XIII^e siècle. Quant au sens de « courtoiser, louer, admirer avec excès », il semble vraiment moderne. Et surtout ce n'est pas l'idée contenue dans

⁶⁴ Paraphrase bouffonne du Livre de Job, V, 7 « Homo ad laborem nascitur et avis ad volandum. » et sans doute allusion aux Épîtres de Paul, 1 Th 4, 10-12, 2 Th 3, 7-10 sur la valeur du travail.

⁶⁵ *Epistula Petri*, I, 5/8 : « adversarius vester diabolus tanquam leo rugiens circuit quaerens quem devoret »...

⁶⁶ Gautier de Châtillon est un personnage intéressant pour notre recherche pour bien des raisons : par son talent qui l'avait rendu célèbre, par son origine flamande (« Gautier de Lille »), par sa carrière de « goliard », par son *Alexandreide* (achevée au plus tard en 1176), par son mécène enfin, Guillaume de Champagne, archevêque de Reims.

adulor/adulari que les trouvères ont retenue, mais, celle, tout empreinte de sacré, d'*adorare*, d'où la très grande fréquence dans leurs chansons du verbe roman *ao(u)rer* pour qualifier l'adoration révérentielle éprouvée devant la Dame. On peut penser que si Hélinand avait voulu faire ici une allusion à la lyrique vernaculaire, ou s'il avait été un familier de ce vocabulaire étroitement topique, il aurait choisi un autre terme – comme *adorer* – et non *aduler* dont la langue vernaculaire n'usait pas.

En ce qui concerne l'*art du trouver*, enfin, un bref récapitulatif nous en dressera le cadre historique. Dans les années 1180, la chanson troubadouresque en langue d'oc est toujours en pleine floraison. Mais il faut raison garder : les troubadours sont loin et les trouvères ne sont pas tous de grands voyageurs ! Vers 1180/1185⁶⁷, au Nord en langue d'oïl, nous pouvons citer

⁶⁷ Les dates des trouvères sont à la fois très approximatives et très hypothétiques, cf. R. DRAGONETTI, « fin du XII^e siècle », dans *La technique poétique des trouvères dans la chanson courtoise* – ed. De Tempel, Bruges, 1960, Slatkine reprints, Genève, 1979, pp. 651-698, c'est-à-dire -/+ 1170 -/+ 1210 :

- trouvères entre 1180 et 1190, Chrétien de Troyes étant mort, le seul trouvère dont on soit certain qu'il composait déjà vers 1180 est Conon de Béthune ; tout le reste repose sur des preuves très fragiles et/ou des reconstructions : on suppose que le Vidame de Chartres, (s'il est bien Guillaume de Ferrière † ca 1204, alors qu'il était parti à la croisade de 1202) était né vers 1155 et aurait composé ses deux chansons vers 1188. Parmi ceux qui ont participé à la troisième croisade de 1190, on trouve Guiot de Provins et Renaut de Sableuil (une seule chanson) ;

- entre 1190 et 1200 : Blondel de Nesles, le Châtelain de Couci, Hugues de Berzé † 1220 sont partis à la quatrième croisade (1202) ; l'identité du seigneur de Craon qui a composé reste très incertaine, même si la chanson revendique une tradition lyrique en cette famille. Placer Renaut de Beaujeu (en fait de Baugé) à la fin du XII^e siècle, c'est dater le *Roman de Guillaume de Dole* du tout début du XIII^e siècle, ce qui est très contesté ; Roger d'Andeli est cité dans des chartes de 1190-1223, il participa à la croisade en Albigeois, on ignore quand il mourut ; Aubouin de Sézanne était mort en 1229 ; pour le dire actif avant le XIII^e siècle, il faut s'appuyer sur une chanson (d'attribution disputée) dédiée à la comtesse de Brie, faussement identifiée à Marie de Champagne, alors qu'il s'agit de Blanche de Navarre ;

- autour de 1200 : Thibaut de Champagne (né en 1201) parle de Thibaut de Blaison † 1229 comme de son « ami », ce qui ne laisse pas supposer entre les deux seigneurs une différence d'âge si importante. Audefrois le Bastard, habitué du Puy d'Arras, se voit assigner une date aussi haute que le XII^e siècle pour avoir dédié une chanson à Jean de Nesles, ici identifié à Jean I de Nesles, ce qui n'a rien de sûr ; un Pierre de Corbie est cité fin XII^e siècle (1188, 1191, 1195) mais il est très improbable qu'il s'agisse du trouvère qui composa une chanson envoyée à Adam de Givenci († peu avant 1268) ; de Raoul de Ferrières (s'il s'agit bien du trouvère), on possède une unique charte datée de 1209 qui ne coïncide pas nécessairement avec celle d'un homme à l'âge avancé. Quant à Gautier de Dargies, ami de Gace Brulé, il vivait encore en 1236, comme Gilles de Vieux-Maison, pourtant rangé dans les trouvères du XII^e siècle... Sur l'existence de Gace, enfin, l'Histoire nous apprend qu'il chantait en 1213 (fragment de compte à payer avant l'Ascension de l'an 1213, mentionnant entre le 25 décembre 1212 et le 2 février 1213 : *Gatho Bruslez : de dono apud Meduntam 10 lib.* À la cour de Mantes, Gace avait mérité une gratification, sans nul doute pour avoir chanté – on a le même genre de

Chrétien de Troyes qui chanta d'amour et était déjà mort, le Vidame de Chartres, Raoul de Ferrières (?) ... Guiot de Provins, encore vivant, était, quant à lui, un vrai jongleur. La longue liste des cours où il est passé n'a rien à voir avec les rares seigneurs qu'évoque Hélinand dans ses *Vers de la Mort* ! Parti de Champagne, où il a fréquenté tous les châteaux des officiers du comte, ces cours où l'on appréciait l'*art du trouver*, Guiot est allé jusqu'à Mayence à la diète de Frédéric Barberousse, a longuement visité la famille des princes Plantagenêts avec leurs vassaux, est descendu en Arles, a finalement passé la mer et est revenu de la troisième croisade, pour se réfugier à Cluny, en vieux poète désormais oublié⁶⁸.

La constellation poétique qui rayonnera autour du champenois Gace Brulé n'est pas encore en place : Conon de Béthune a, certes, commencé à chanter. Mais l'ampleur du corpus de chansons qui nous sont parvenues sous le nom de Blondel de Nesles, châtelain de Bruges, laisse penser que, comme l'avait démontré Holger Petersen Dygve, il s'agit non de Jean I de Nesles, châtelain de Bruges, qui mourut dès 1200, mais de Jean II, † 1239 ; le châtelain de Couci⁶⁹, enlevé à la fleur de l'âge⁷⁰, disparut pendant la traversée qui menait vers Constantinople (1202). En bref, encore peu nombreux sont les trouvères qui chantent déjà en terre d'oïl en 1180. Et entre 1180/1190, ils ne nous ont laissé aucun texte qui s'apparenterait à ce que les Provençaux appelaient *sirventes*. Cela viendra plus tard, les trouvères appelleront ce registre *satire*, mais en cette fin du XII^e siècle, ce qu'ils satirisent en lyrique vernaculaire, ce sont les croisés *recreanz*, ainsi d'Hue d'Oisi.

En revanche, la critique contre l'Église, contre Rome, contre ses cardinaux, contre les princes avarés et les lâches a déjà une très longue tradition derrière elle⁷¹, mais elle se réserve encore la langue latine. Il faut recon-

texte pour Andrieu Contredit qui était, lui aussi, un chevalier (il participa à la croisade de 1239) et avait reçu un don dans les mêmes circonstances. L'amitié de Gace avec Conon, qui chante de 1180 à 1202, avec Blondel de Nesles, qui dut commencer à chanter à la fin du XII^e s., et avec le Châtelain de Couci, mort en mer encore très jeune en 1202, nous amène donc à penser que le cercle des poètes champenois, traditionnellement considérés comme « la première génération de trouvères », fut florissant à la toute fin du XII^e siècle et au début du XIII^e (1190/1215) quand Hélinand ne vivait plus dans le « siècle ».

⁶⁸ La *Bible Guiot* est datée de 1208.

⁶⁹ Le trouvère Gui de Thourotte, châtelain de Couci, était de la parenté des Dreux, en raison du mariage d'Adèle de Dreux avec Jean de Thourotte, châtelain de Noyon.

⁷⁰ C'est ce qu'a bien établi D. Barthélémy, *Les deux âges de la seigneurie banale. Pouvoir et société dans terre des sires de Coucy (milieu du XI^e-milieu du XIII^e siècle)*, Publications de la Sorbonne, 1984, p. 176.

⁷¹ Ces satires passent du latin (sur les *status*) au roman avec le *Livre des Manières* (vers 1170) d'Étienne de Fougères, ce texte en vers n'appartient aucunement à la lyrique, non plus que ses descendants du XII^e siècle.

naître qu'Hélinand, avec son immense culture cléricale et latine, semble plus proche de la lyrique latine que de celle des poètes vernaculaires. Et il semble peu sûr que le terme *adulare* puisse renvoyer aux amours humaines, alors que les femmes tiennent dans l'œuvre d'Hélinand une place tellement réduite qu'hormis Eve et Marie, on ne les y trouve pas.

S'il a cependant – risquons l'hypothèse – chanté d'amour, comme le faisaient tant de jeunes clercs étudiants, il se peut tout aussi bien qu'ayant chanté en latin, il y ait connu la gloire. On évoquera le précédent fameux, antérieur il est vrai, d'Abélard dont nous n'avons nulle trace d'une lyrique en langue vernaculaire. En revanche, le ton fanfaron du Maître dialecticien fait penser aux vantardises d'Hélinand :

Tanti quippe tunc nominis eram et juventutis et formae gratia praeeminēbam ut quamcunque feminarum nostro dignarer amore, nullam vererem repulsam.⁷²

[J'avais alors acquis une telle renommée, je dominais de si haut par ma jeunesse et ma beauté que, quelle que fût la femme que nous voulussions honorer de notre amour, nous n'avions pas à craindre de la trouver rebelle...]

et le contexte est identique, puisqu'il s'agit, en poussant au noir le tableau des erreurs passées, de les condamner. Abélard dont nous avons conservé des hymnes magnifiques et des *planctus*, avait aussi composé des chansons d'amour, qui connurent un grand succès :

Et si qua invenire liceret carmina, essent amatoria, non philosophiae secreta. Quorum etiam carminum pleraque adhuc in multis, sicut et ipse nosti, frequentantur et decantantur regionibus, ab his maxime quos vita simul oblectat.⁷³

[Et s'il m'arrivait de composer quelques pièces de vers, c'était l'amour, non la philosophie, qui me les dictait. De ces vers, vous le savez, la plupart devenus populaires en maints pays, sont encore chantés fréquemment, surtout par ceux qui connaissent le bonheur d'une vie semblable.]⁷⁴

Ces *carmina* amoureux sont également attestés par Héloïse dans sa correspondance, il n'y a pas lieu de les juger fictifs. En revanche, comme pour Hélinand, on n'en a nulle trace, peut-être en raison de la conversion ou de la transformation de l'ex-poète ?

VI – Pour clore cet « état des lieux », il reste à donner, deux arguments dont l'un infirme plutôt ce qu'on vient de voir et l'autre le confirmerait.

⁷² *Petri Abaelardi Opera* – ed. V. COUSIN, Paris 1849, p. 10. Le passage au « nous » est sans nul doute ironique.

⁷³ *ibid.* p. 11.

⁷⁴ Traduction d'O. GRÉARD sur le texte établi par V. COUSIN, Paris, Garnier, 1875, en ligne (wikisource.org).

1 – Le premier argument se déduit de la lecture des *Vers de la Mort*, c'est la fameuse strophe XVIII :

Morz, qui as contes et as rois,
 Acorces lor anz et lor mois,
 Qu'onques nus aloignier ne pout :
 Chartres et Chaalons et Blois,
 Salue por les Thibaudois,
 Loëis, Renaut et Rotrou ! (v. 1-6)

Ce qui nous arrêtera ici est le terme *Thibaudois*. En effet les Thibaudiens manifestèrent dès le XII^e siècle une véritable tradition de mécénat. Hélinand ne fait pas allusion aux dames que tout le monde cite toujours, Marie et Aelis, les deux filles d'Aliénor d'Aquitaine, mais bien aux seigneurs de la famille. On connaît Henri le Libéral qui fut un esprit des plus éclairés, grand ami de Jean de Salisbury et digne fils de son père, Thibaut II le Grand. C'est par ce Thibaut II le Grand que s'explique l'appartenance de Louis, Renaut et Rotrou à une seule famille thibaudienne : ils l'avaient tous pour arrière grand-père. On n'aura garde d'oublier que Thibaut II le Grand, comte de Blois et de Champagne, était un familier de Bernard de Clairvaux qu'il reçut souvent en ses domaines. Après lui, les Thibaudiens garderont une ferveur toute spéciale pour les moines blancs, jusqu'à Thibaut IV le Chansonnier, inclus. C'est seulement avec Thibaut V, gendre de saint Louis, que la prédilection pour les Frères Mendiants l'emporte.

Louis comte de Blois et de Chartres, né en 1171, était encore tout jeune quand furent écrits les *Vers de la Mort*. Son père, Thibaut V, mourut devant Saint-Jean-d'Acre en 1191. Mais dès 1184, Louis avait épousé Catherine de Clermont et, d'après ses chartes, étudiées par Auguste Longnon, Louis se trouvait aussi souvent à Clermont qu'à Blois. Clermont est tout proche des villages que l'on a proposés comme lieu d'origine d'Hélinand, et s'il paraît douteux que l'on trouve à leur sujet une certitude, la critique dans son ensemble accepte l'idée d'une localisation dans ce petit territoire picard. Qu'Hélinand ait connu Louis, nous le savons par la strophe XVIII des *Vers de la Mort*, cela ne fait que confirmer la noblesse d'Hélinand, fréquentant la cour d'un très jeune et brillant seigneur. Renaut de Bar devint l'évêque de Chartres en 1182 (jusqu'à 1217)⁷⁵ et Rotrou du Perche⁷⁶, évêque de Châlons-en-Champagne (1190-1201). Les seigneurs

⁷⁵ Il était le troisième fils de Renaut II de Bar et d'Agnès de Champagne (tante de Louis de Blois), mariés en 1155 ; son frère aîné Henri, mort en 1190 devant Acre, et le cadet Thibaut vivaient déjà vers 1158 ; Renaut était donc le strict contemporain d'Hélinand.

⁷⁶ Il était le fils de Rotrou IV, seigneur du Perche, et Mahaut de Champagne (tante de Louis de Blois). Havise de Salisbury, mère de Rotrou IV, devenue veuve de Rotrou III, se remaria avec Robert de Dreux. Les comtes du Perche étaient ainsi alliés avec les Dreux-Thibaudiens-

de Clermont furent des amateurs de poésie lyrique. On peut penser qu'au château du jeune Louis de Blois, on chantait plutôt en langue vernaculaire qu'en langue latine. Il est possible aussi que les cousins, déjà évêques ou en voie de le devenir, aient visité la demeure de Louis. Lorsqu'en 1199, un autre cousin, Thibaut III de Champagne, épousa Blanche de Navarre à Chartres, la liste des seigneurs présents, que nous avons conservée, montre que toute la parentèle s'y trouvait.

Dernier point qui révèle qu'Hélinand avait des connaissances parmi les trouvères, la strophe II des *Vers de la Mort*, mais il serait difficile de dire s'il s'est compté parmi eux.

Morz, va m'a çaus qui d'amors chantent
 Et qui de vanité se vantent,
 Si les apren si a chanter
 Com font cil qui par ce t'enchantent
 Que tot hors del siecle se plantent,
 Que tu nes puisses sozplanter.
 Morz, tu ne sés çaus enchanter
 Qui le tien chant suelent chanter
 Et la paor Dieu en enfantent :
 Cuers qui tel fruit puet enfanter
 Por voir le puis acreanter
 Que nul tien gieu ne le sozplantent.

La plupart des amis que cite Hélinand sont des ecclésiastiques. Outre les évêques nommés ci-dessus de Chartres et de Châlons, Etienne de Nemours⁷⁷, évêque de Noyon de 1188 à 1198, Henri de Dreux, évêque d'Orléans de 1182 à 1199 (il était né en 1155) sont salués dans la strophe XVII. Enfin, il y a Philippe de Dreux (1158-1217), évêque de Beauvais en 1175.

Avec la lignée des Dreux⁷⁸, nous avons encore une fois une véritable famille de mécènes. De Philippe de Dreux, évêque-comte de Beauvais, l'Histoire a surtout retenu son rôle guerrier, il n'oublia jamais qu'il était comte⁷⁹ ! Mais il faut aussi se rappeler qu'il fut un mécène éclairé, protégé-

Châtillon cf. M.-G. GROSSEL, *Le milieu littéraire en Champagne sous les Thibaudiens*, Orléans, Paradigme, 1995, t. I, p. 62-80 (édition de la thèse de doctorat d'état). Le mariage de Rotrou IV et Mahaut est de date incertaine « avant 1160 » et Rotrou était leur troisième enfant.

⁷⁷ Son père Gautier de Villebéon avait été chambellan de Louis VII, puis de Philippe Auguste, il était d'origine modeste (*Fuit nobilior gestis quam genere nobile*, écrit Aubri de Trois-Fontaines) et sa seigneurie lui venait de son épouse Aveline de Nemours. Sur tous ces points cf. E. RICHEMOND, *Recherches généalogiques sur la famille de Nemours, du XII^e au XIV^e siècle*, Bourges, 1907-1908.

⁷⁸ Pour le mécénat des Seigneurs de Dreux, voir *Le milieu littéraire*, loc. cit.

⁷⁹ Affirmation à nuancer en la replaçant dans son époque, cf. O. GUYOT JEANNIN, *Episcopus et comes, affirmation et déclin de la seigneurie épiscopale au Nord du Royaume de*

geant notamment Pierre de Beauvais qui lui dédia ses *Bestiaires* en versions courte et longue ainsi qu'une *Mappemonde*. C'est Philippe de Dreux qui versions avait exigé l'emploi de la prose. Pierre de Beauvais écrivit encore pour son religieux mécène trois vies de saints (Eustache, Josse, Germer), c'était incontestablement un écrivain de talent.

Les seigneurs de Dreux avaient toujours entretenu avec les thibaudiens des relations teintées de méfiance, mais ils s'étaient solidement implantés dans le comté de Champagne par leurs alliances, avec les Braine, Baudemont et surtout Châtillon. Tous ces parents furent aussi des mécènes de trouvères. Bien que les seigneurs de Dreux aient conservé jalousement le souvenir de leur sang royal, il est bien plus probable qu'un poète comme Hélinand ait trouvé des amateurs capables de l'apprécier dans la famille des Dreux-Châtillon qu'à la cour de Philippe Auguste, qui n'avait guère de connaissance du latin et n'aimait pas la lyrique. Par ses relations avec les Dreux, Hélinand s'ouvrait un grand nombre de cours de Champagne où se cultivait *l'art du trouver*. Parmi les plus puissants de ces seigneurs, beaucoup avaient un fils dans le clergé séculier, comme ce fut le cas pour les Traînel ou les Joinville.

On peut se demander si Hélinand n'a pas fréquenté le cercle très lettré de l'archevêque de Reims Guillaume⁸⁰, qu'il ne nomme pas dans ses *Vers de la Mort*. Est-ce parce qu'il l'englobe dans la condamnation qu'il porte contre le roi dans l'affaire de la reine Ingeburge ? Guillaume de Champagne avait sans hésiter choisi d'appuyer le divorce de son royal neveu.

2 – Le second et ultime argument que nous allons maintenant considérer apporte une heureuse précision à cette esquisse de la jeunesse du moine de Froidmont. Qu'il ait ou non apprécié la beauté de la lyrique de *Fine Amour*, Hélinand connaît et dut écouter en l'appréciant la littérature vernaculaire. On en trouve deux preuves dans son œuvre.

La première concerne les légendes épiques. André Moisan a étudié la façon dont Hélinand incorpore dans sa *Chronique* le texte du Pseudo-Turpin, sans le remettre en cause, mais en dégageant soigneusement les faits, tant historiques que légendaires, de « la gangue moralisante » où les avait noyés Aimery Picaud⁸¹. Aubri de Trois-Fontaines lui reprendra en l'ac-

France (Beauvais-Noyon, X^e - début XIII^e siècle), Genève, Droz, 1987.

⁸⁰ Guillaume de Champagne, archevêque de Reims, était frère de Henri le Libéral, de la reine Adèle, mère de Philippe Auguste, enfin des comtesses Agnès de Bar et Mahaut du Perche.

⁸¹ A. MOISAN, « Clercs et légendes épiques, Hélinand de Froidmont, Aubri de Trois-Fontaines, Vincent de Beauvais et la *Chronique du Pseudo-Turpin* », *Au carrefour des routes d'Europe, la chanson de geste*, X^e congrès international de la Société Rencesvals, pour l'étude des épopées romanes, Strasbourg, 1985, *Senefiance*, public. du CUERMA, Aix-en-Provence, 20 (1987) pp. 913-925. L'influence du Pseudo-Turpin sur le récit d'Hélinand est en outre

centuant cette habitude de considérer les textes littéraires non seulement comme histoires dignes de mention, mais aussi comme pierre à apporter à l'édifice historique. Un magnifique portrait de Charlemagne (an. 790) est en quelque sorte le « frontispice » qu'a voulu donner Hélinand à ces hauts faits qui le passionnaient.

La seconde preuve de cet intérêt est l'allusion extrêmement célèbre au Graal. Des générations de médiévistes ont tourné et retourné les explications d'Hélinand pour en extraire tout le miel possible – et davantage encore !

Chronique an. 720 Hoc tempore in Britannia cuidam eremitæ monstrata est mirabilis quædam visio per Angelum de sancto Joseph decurione [= d'Arimathie] qui corpus Domini deposuit de cruce; et de catino illo sive paropside, in quo Dominus cœnavit cum discipulis suis; de quo ab eodem eremita descripta est historia quæ dicitur de gradali. Gradalis autem sive Gradale gallice dicitur scutella lata et aliquantulum profunda, in qua pretiosæ dapes cum suo jure divitibus solent apponi gradatim [...] et dicitur vulgari nomine graalz quia grata et acceptabilis est in ea comedenti [...] Hanc historiam Latine scriptam invenire non potui, sed tantum Gallice scripta habetur a quibusdam proceribus, nec facile, ut aiunt, tota inveniri potest. Hanc autem nondum potui ad legendum sedulo ab aliquo impetrare. Quod mox ut potuero, verisimiliora et utiliora succincte transferam in Latinum.⁸² [En ce temps-là, en Bretagne, un ange fit voir à certain ermite une vision merveilleuse au sujet du décurion Joseph [d'Arimathie], celui qui avait déposé de la croix le corps du Seigneur; et cela touchait aussi à ce plat creux – ou plat long – dans lequel le Seigneur avait mangé la cène avec ses disciples. C'est de là que cet ermite écrivit l'*histoire* dite du Graal. De fait un « graal » (*gradalis* masculin ou *gradale* neutre), désigne en langue romane un plat (/ une écuelle) large et peu profond dans lequel des mets coûteux sont habituellement posés et présentés de façon cérémonielle en différentes couches [...]. Si on l'appelle en langue vulgaire « greal », c'est qu'il est a-gréa-ble et apporte du plaisir à qui mange ce qu'il contient [...] Je n'ai pu trouver cette histoire écrite en latin, mais certains grands seigneurs la possèdent uniquement en langue romane et, affirment-ils, il n'est pas facile d'en trouver le texte complet. Je n'ai pu davantage la demander à quelque ami empressé pour que je la lise; mais sitôt que j'en aurai la possibilité, je transcrirai de façon concise en latin ce qu'elle contient de vraisemblable ou d'utile.]

Ainsi, c'est alors qu'il est déjà devenu moine qu'Hélinand reste en contact avec la littérature vernaculaire – on aura reconnu l'*Estoire del Saint Graal* – il sait que des amis nobles ont écouté cette histoire, ils en ont discuté et il

minorée par les coupes sombres qu'opéra B. Tissier, le premier éditeur du texte en 1669 (les événements se situent entre 809 et 814 date de la mort de l'empereur), citation p. 917.

⁸² *PL*, t. 212, pp. 816-817.

veut se la procurer. Derrière lui, en toute confiance, Vincent de Beauvais recopiera les mêmes réflexions sur le Graal.

Cette attitude de curiosité envers le monde et l'hagiographie, envers la littérature profane ou sacrée est l'une des marques de l'esprit d'Hélinand, admirée et imitée par ses contemporains. Elle est aussi ce qui le poussa à collecter les légendes populaires, par exemple pour la *mesnie Hellequin*, à la façon d'un Giraud de Cambrie ou de Gautier Map. Mais d'après les livres qu'il commandita, on peut penser que l'évêque de Beauvais partageait ce goût d'Hélinand, qui s'adresse à lui avec la rude familiarité d'un vieux compagnon.

On se gardera d'oublier le statut registral des *Vers de la Mort*. La très grande valeur du poème, ainsi que l'aisance manifestée par Hélinand, comptent certainement parmi les meilleurs arguments pour défendre une carrière antérieure de poète. Et les *Vers de la Mort* sont en langue vernaculaire. Hélinand est l'inventeur de la forme adoptée dans les douzains, une forme appelée à une longue faveur. Face à une composition originale, les copistes ont varié le titre, on trouve :

Li dis de le mort (ms. Bruxelles, Bibl. Roy. de Belgique, 9411-9426); *Romanum de morte* (ms. Ars. 5201, inc.); *Li romanz de la mort* (ms. Ars. 5201, expl.); *Li ver de le mort* (ms. BnF, fr. 1444); *Le fabel de la mort* (ms. BnF, fr. 25408); *Dit des vers de la mort* (ms. BnF, fr. 23111).

Les copistes ou les rubricateurs ont donc opté majoritairement pour un genre *non chanté*. L'intituler « Vers » n'est qu'une des possibilités retenues. Pour les acceptions nombreuses de ce terme, on renverra à l'article de Pascale Bourgain⁸³ où tout ce qu'il faut savoir se trouve réuni. Récemment, Levente Seláf dans sa thèse sur la chanson pieuse, a enquêté pour savoir si le douzain d'Hélinand avait pu être lyrique⁸⁴. Mais ses recherches, en ce qui concerne du moins les *Vers de la Mort*, n'ont pas abouti à une certitude. En revanche, selon cette étude, des poèmes chantés ont adopté par la suite le schéma hélinandien et s'apparentent généralement au genre de la *complainte* ce qui fait penser aux *planctus* d'Abélard (mais ces derniers ont une forme autre.)

Pour conclure, Hélinand fut probablement un poète, mais seule la valeur des œuvres écrites quand il était devenu moine peut nous le laisser penser et de toutes façons, s'il y eut activité de chanteur, cela dura sans doute assez peu. Les seigneurs qu'Hélinand cite ont été des mécènes, mais non de lyrique profane. Il est presque assuré qu'Hélinand avait fait des études de

⁸³ P. BOURGAIN, « Qu'est-ce qu'un vers au Moyen Âge? », *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*, 147 (1989) pp. 231-282.

⁸⁴ L. Seláf, *Chanter plus haut, la chanson religieuse vernaculaire au Moyen Âge, essai de contextualisation*, Paris, Champion, 2008, pp. 59-89.

clerc. S'il fut en rapport avec la cour royale, c'est très probablement pour son *Miroir aux Princes*. Hélinand a ainsi peu à voir avec le *personnage* mis en scène par Alexandre de Bernay dans le *Roman d'Alexandre*. Le choix du prénom d'Elinant par le romancier nous échappe, si vraiment il a correspondu à une quelconque intention.

Enfin les *vers de la Mort* relèvent du registre très vaste du *Dit*. Ils en constituent l'un des plus remarquables fleurons. Si Hélinand n'a pas choisi la lyrique pour lancer contre nous *Mort* toute puissante, il a su donner à son texte un extraordinaire lyrisme (au sens moderne cette fois).

Il semble qu'on n'en puisse pas dire davantage.

Summary

Biographies of Helinand of Froidmont, prefacing his very famous *Vers de la Mort* (*Verses of Death*), have features that are virtually obligatory, yet which are far from having equal value. We can find some meagre information in the Cistercian's own writings: about his ancestors, when he recalls the murder of Charles the Good, who was the cause of their exile; about his uncle, chancellor to Henri of France, the Archbishop of Rheims; about his own renunciation of worldly life, in his *De reparatione lapsi* or in the *Vers de la Mort* themselves.

Further investigation brings us from Migne to Philip of Bergamo, authors repeating one after the other information deriving from Vincent of Beauvais, who made extensive use of Helinand's *Chronicle*, very quickly pillaged by his successors. These short Latin notices lay stress on the religious and "serious" work of the monk of Froidmont. A second current, which dates back to the sixteenth century humanists, is concerned with the Romance language poet. It is to these enlightened amateurs that we can trace the image of a troubadour singing in the courts, specifically that of Philip Augustus. The "evidence" for this is supposed to be the jongleur named Elinant, mentioned in a single *laisse* of the *Roman d'Alexandre*.

However, if the survey is based this time on internal criticism (the image, ironic in all respects, that the Cistercian paints of his past as a singer), or in a (vain) search for traces of any activity of Helinand in the literary circles of his time and what remains of their verses, the best we can do is put forward a very probable hypothesis: Helinand was undoubtedly a poet in Latin verse, famous in his time, and certainly an avid connoisseur of certain styles of vernacular literature, *chansons de geste* and the romance of the Grail.

Les biographies d'Hélinand de Froidmont, introduisant à ses très célèbres *Vers de la Mort*, présentent des traits quasi obligés qui sont pourtant loin d'avoir tous valeur égale. Nous trouvons quelques maigres renseignements dans l'œuvre même

du cistercien: sur ses ascendants lorsqu'il évoque le meurtre de Charles le Bon qui fut la cause de leur exil; sur son oncle, chancelier auprès de l'archêveque de Reims, Henri de France; sur son renoncement à la vie dans le siècle, dans son *De reparatione lapsi* ou dans les *Vers de la mort* mêmes.

Une enquête plus poussée nous ramène de Migne à Philippe de Bergame, les auteurs reprenant les uns après les autres des renseignements venus de Vincent de Beauvais, qui utilisa largement la *Chronique* d'Hélinand, très vite pillée par ses continuateurs. Ces courtes notices en latin insistent sur l'oeuvre religieuse et « sérieuse » du moine de Froidmont. Un second courant, qui remonte aux humanistes du XVI^e siècle, s'intéresse au poète en langue romane. C'est à ces amateurs éclairés que remonte l'image d'un trouvère chantant dans les cours et particulièrement auprès de Philippe Auguste, la « preuve » en serait le jongleur nommé Elinant qu'évoque une unique laisse du *Roman d'Alexandre*.

Cependant si l'enquête se fonde cette fois sur la critique interne (l'image en tout point ironique que le cistercien brosse de son passé de chanteur) ou la recherche (vaine) de traces d'une activité d'Hélinand dans les milieux littéraires contemporains et dans ce qui nous reste de leurs vers, nous ne pouvons que poser une hypothèse très probable: Hélinand fut sans doute un poète en vers latins, célèbre en son temps, et assurément un fervent connaisseur de certains registres de la littérature vernaculaire, chansons de geste et roman du Graal.

The Odyssey of the Manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon**

Corneille H. KNEEPKENS

(Groningen)

1. Introduction

The *Chronicon* of Helinand, a monk in the Cistercian Abbey of Froidmont (* c. 1160 – † after 1229), is a comprehensive universal history originally consisting of forty-nine books and covering the history of God's creation from its inception to the first decade of the thirteenth century. Only fragments of the original work written between 1211 and 1223 have however survived in two manuscripts and one seventeenth-century printing. The Ms *London, British Library, Cotton. Claudius B IX*, dating from c. 1400 and already attested in the 1420s in England, preserves the first sixteen books of an early redaction. The first eighteen books of a later redaction that, in all probability, was revised by the author himself are found in the Vatican Ms *Reginensis latinus 535*, a manuscript said to have been written in the third decade of the thirteenth century. Books 45-49, which were edited by Cistercian scholar Bertrand Tissier in 1669,¹ comprise a

* This contribution is based on (1) the material that is the result of the research carried out by the late Dr. Edmé Smits, the *auctor intellectualis* of the Groningen Helinand Project, (2) the research done by the members of the Groningen Helinand Research Team [The following researchers were and/or are involved in the edition of Helinand's *Chronicon* over the years (ordered according to team seniority): Edmé Smits, Hans Voorbij and Rinus Woesthuis, Meindert Geertsma, Onno Kneepkens, Eric Saak, Eric Wierda, and Bea Blokhuis], and (3) the discussions held during the team's regular meetings on progress and problems. I would like here to acknowledge Prof. Katherine Elliot van Liere (Calvin College) for her numerous helpful and invaluable comments on an earlier version of this article and her help with the English translation.

¹ Bertrand TISSIER, *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium sive Opera Abbatum et Monachorum Cisterciensis Ordinis, Qui saeculo S. Bernardi, aut paulo post eius obitum floruerunt*, Tomus septimus exhibens: *Helinandi Frigidi-Montis Monachi Chronicorum ultimam & praecipuam partem quae sola superest, ex MSS. eiusdem loci nunc primum editam* ..., Paris, 1669; for Tissier's life, see below, p. 366-367.

printed edition based on a manuscript kept in the library of the Abbey of Froidmont that disappeared in the last decade of the nineteenth century.²

This essay will discuss the history of the manuscripts of Helinand's chronicle, while exploring the attention that medieval, early modern and modern scholars paid to Helinand's *Chronicon*, and the motives behind their interest in Helinand, his chronicle and its manuscripts.

2. *Helinand's Chronicon and the Historiography of the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries*

In his discussion of the success and effectiveness of the writings of medieval historiographers, the French historian Bernard Guenée places Helinand's *Chronicon* in the large category of works of which only one or two manuscripts have been preserved, and consequently had little influence in the medieval and early modern period.³ Paul Lehmann had already shown, however, in his 1918 article "Aufgaben und Anregungen der lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters",⁴ that the importance of Helinand's *Chronicon*

² For a thorough survey of Helinand's life, his works and the manuscripts of the *Chronicon*, see E.R. SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text of Seneca's Tragedies", *Mnemosyne. Bibliotheca Classica Batava*, Series IV, 36 (1983), pp. 324-358, esp. pp. 328-337, and idem, "Editing the Chronicon of Helinand of Froidmont: the marginal notes", *Sacris Erudiri. Jaarboek voor Godsdienstwetenschappen*, 32 (1991), pp. 269-289.

Smits (SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text", p. 335) follows Malewich in noting that the two manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon* are undeniably independent witnesses of the text; see M.H. MALEWICZ, "Libellus de efficatia artis astrologice. Traité astrologique d'Eudes de Champagne XII^e siècle", *Mediaevalia Philosophica Polonorum*, 20 (1974), pp. 3-95, esp. p. 33. Voorbij and Woesthuis correctly speak of two text phases or redactions, see J.B. VOORBIJ – M.M. WOESTHUIS, "Editing the 'Chronicon' of Helinand of Froidmont: the use of the textual witnesses", in *Media Latinitas. A collection of essays to mark the occasion of the retirement of L.J. Engels* – ed. R.I.A. NIP – H. VAN DIJK – E.M.C. VAN HOUTS, – C.H. KNEEPKENS – G.A.A. KORTEKAAS, Steenbrugge – Turnhout, 1996, pp. 345-354, esp. p. 346.

³ B. GUENÉE, *Histoire et culture historique dans l'Occident médiéval*, Paris, 1980, p. 252 [chapitre VI: *Le succès de l'œuvre*]: "Les œuvres historiques dont il ne reste que deux ou un seul manuscrit, ou dont, même, aucun manuscrit médiéval ne subsiste, sont innombrables. J'ai simplement, ici, retenu quelques rares exemples. ... Hélinand de Froidmont *Chronicon* 2." In a note, Guenée refers to the bibliographical note by M.-P. ARNAULD-CANCEL, "Le huitième livre de la chronique d'Hélinand de Froidmont", in *Positions des thèses de l'École des chartes soutenues par les élèves de la promotion de 1971*, Paris, 1971, pp. 9-14.

⁴ P. LEHMANN, "Aufgaben und Anregungen der lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters", in *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, Jahrgang 1918*, 8. Abhandlung. Only in 1912 did Lehmann mention, for the first time in scholarly literature, the three manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon* that were so far known; see his "Literaturgeschichte im Mittelalter", *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, 4 (1912), pp. 569-82, 617-30, 690. Reprints of both articles are also found in Paul LEHMANN, *Erforschung des Mittelalters*, Stuttgart, 1941. For

should not be inferred from the number of preserved manuscripts, since this work had been used intensively and excerpted at length by Vincent of Beauvais. O.P. Vincent made comprehensive use of what he called the "monumental" manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* for his famous *Speculum Historiale*,⁵ which was reworked and translated into several vernacular languages, e.g. into Dutch by Jacob van Maerlant as the *Spieghel Historiael*.⁶ In addition, one also encounters several references to Helinand's universal chronicle in Vincent's *Speculum Naturale* and *Speculum Doctrinale*. Since the *Speculum Historiale* was one of the most important historical works of the Middle Ages, Vincent's frequent use of Helinand's *Chronicon* ensured that the latter work became widely known, albeit indirectly, in this period.

The Cistercian monk Aubri of Trois-Fontaines (d. after 1251) is the only other medieval historian who we know had direct access to Helinand's *Chronicon*. He compiled a universal chronicle in the 1250s. Immediately after the entry for the year 633, he states: Here begin the third book of Bede and the book of Helinand.⁷ This corresponds to the beginning of the part of Helinand's 45th book, which has been preserved in the edition of Tissier.⁸ Aubri's chronicle contains several references to Helinand's books 45 to 49. From this, we may safely conclude that Aubri had a manuscript in which only the books from 45 to 49 were found.⁹ The many other references to Helinand's chronicle in medieval historical works can be traced back to the frequently used *Speculum Historiale*. To what extent Walter Bower, the author of the *Scotichronicon*, had direct access to parts of Helinand's *Chronicon*, is still open to further research.¹⁰

Lehmann's role in the reassessment of Helinand's *Chronicon*, see also SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 333-334.

⁵ VINCENT OF BEAUVAIS, *Speculum Historiale* [henceforth *SH* in the notes], 29, 108, Douai, 1624 [repr. Graz, 1965], p. 1222a: "& etiam chronicam diligenter ab initio mundi vsque ad tempus suum in maximo quodam volumine digessit."

⁶ For Maerlant's adaptation of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, see F. VAN OOSTROM, *Maerlants wereld*, Amsterdam, 1999, pp. 307-75.

⁷ ALBERICUS MONACHUS TRIUM FONTIUM, *Chronica*, ed. SCHEFFER-BOICORST, in MGH, *Scriptores*, XXIII, Hannover 1874 [anast. repr. Stuttgart-New York 1963], p. 696: "Liber tertius Bede incipit et liber Elinandi." For difference in approach and assimilation of the material from Helinand's *Chronicon* between Vincent and Aubri, see M. PAULMIER-FOUCART, "Ecrire l'histoire au XIII^e siècle. Vincent de Beauvais et Helinand de Froidmont", *Annales de l'Est*, N.S. 33 (1981), pp. 49-70.

⁸ For Tissier's edition, see above, n. 1.

⁹ I will return to this question below. See p. 382.

¹⁰ For the *Scotichronicon*, see J.B. VOORBIJ, "Bower's use of Vincent of Beauvais", in WALTER BOWER, *Scotichronicon*, vol. 9, ed. D. WATT, Edinburgh, 1998, pp. 260-80, esp. 274-75. The references to Giovanni Mansionario and John Wethamstede in LEHMANN, *Erforschung des Mittelalters* (above, n. 4), p. 93, n. 2 also remain open to further research and elaboration.

The history of the manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon* begins with a remark by Vincent of Beauvais in the bio-bibliographical section that he devotes to Helinand in Book 29 (or 30 in some editions and manuscripts), ch. 108 of his *Speculum Historiale*. He tells us that he did not have the complete text of Helinand's chronicle at his disposal. According to the learned Dominican friar, Helinand's chronicle covered the whole history of the world from the Creation to Helinand's own time, but a complete *Chronicon* was never found. Vincent also mentions that the loss of a substantial part of this work already occurred during Helinand's lifetime. Guérin, bishop of Senlis, chancellor of Philippe Auguste, and an acquaintance of Helinand,¹¹ is said to have been responsible for this tragic loss, for Helinand lent him several quires of his chronicle, and Guérin failed to return them.¹² Because Vincent not only refers often to Helinand's *Chronicon* as his source, but also mentions, more than once, the number of the book from which he borrows the texts at issue, we know that, in any case, he had access to books 1 to 26 and 40 to 48.¹³

The manuscripts of the *Chronicon* that have been positively identified are two codices from Cistercian abbeys in the neighbourhood of Beauvais, viz. Froidmont (the codex used by Tissier for his edition) and Beaupré (the present Vatican manuscript), and a manuscript of uncertain origin now kept in the British Library that was already attested in the 1420s in England (the present Cottonian manuscript). I will deal comprehensively with them below,¹⁴ but first I intend to discuss the reception of Helinand in secondary literature, particularly by medieval and early modern writers. Unfortunately, modern scholarship has not been able to identify the manuscript used by Vincent.

3. *The Writers or Scholars Bio-bibliographies*

Because Vincent of Beauvais so largely adopted material from Helinand's chronicle and devoted a bio-bibliographical section of the *Speculum His-*

¹¹ For Guérin, see J.W. BALDWIN, *The Government of Philip Augustus. Foundations of French Royal Power in the Middle Ages*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1986, *passim*.

¹² VINCENT OF BEAUVAIS, *SH*, 29, 108, ed. Douai, 1624, col. 1222a: "Fertur enim quod idem Helinandus cuidam familiari suo, scilicet bonæ memoriæ domino Garino Siluanectensi episcopo; quosdam eiusdem operis quaterniones accommodauerit; sicque siue per obliuionem, siue per negligentiam, siue alia de causa penitus amiserit."

¹³ PAULMIER-FOUCART, "Ecrire l'histoire au XIII^e siècle" (above, n. 7), pp. 55-56 states that only the text of the reigns of Constantine the Great (309-340) and the emperors Honorius to Zeno (411-493) was lacking in the codex of Helinand's chronicle which Vincent used. She bases this calculation on the periods dealt with in the books of the *SH* in which Vincent explicitly refers to Helinand, including those references without any book number.

¹⁴ See below, section 6.

toriale to him, we encounter Helinand's name in several late medieval bio-bibliographies of famous writers and scholars with data that can be traced back to Vincent. An illustrative example is the entry on Helinand in Henry of Kirkstede's *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*.¹⁵ Henry was novice master and librarian in the middle of the 14th century in the Benedictine abbey of St. Edmund at Bury, and compiled his *Catalogus* as a study aid for scholars and preachers.¹⁶ By his own account, he based the entry on Helinand on Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, book 30 (29), ch. 108. He condensed the information supplied by Vincent to a mention of Helinand's abbey Froidmont in the Beauvaisis, his acme about 1200, and a list of four of his works, viz. the *Versus de morte*, the letter *De reparatione lapsi*, one book containing "very good preaches", and a comprehensive world-history, "a complete copy of which was never found".¹⁷ Near the end of the Middle Ages, the "scholastic-humanist" Hartmann Schedel wrote a very concise entry on Helinand in his *Weltchronik*, in which he focused on Helinand's *Chronicon*. He, too, borrowed the information on Helinand from Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*.¹⁸

Whereas the medieval bio-bibliographers derived their information about Helinand strictly from chapter 108 of book 29 of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, the Benedictine abbot of Sponheim, Johannes Trithemius (1462-1516),¹⁹ did not limit himself to reading this chapter, but also added to the

¹⁵ HENRY OF KIRKSTED, *Catalogus de libris autenticis et apocrifis*, ed. R.E. ROUSE and M.A. ROUSE, London, 2004.

¹⁶ For Henry's biographical data, see the Introduction to the edition by ROUSE AND ROUSE, pp. xxix-xxxvii and lxxxiv-xci.

¹⁷ HENRY OF KIRKSTED, *Catalogus*, ed. ROUSE & ROUSE, p. 255: "248. Helynandus monachus Frigidi Montis de territorio Belvacensi floruit circa A. Ch. 1200 et scripsit juxta Vincentium in Speculo historiali lib. 30 cap. 108 1. De morte versus elegantes, 2. De reparatione lapsi ad Galterum clericum qui fuerat novitius in ordine Cisterciensi ep. 1, 3. Sermones peroptimos lib. 1, 4. Item cronica ab initio mundi usque ad tempus suum in maximo volumine digessit, sed hoc quidem opus dispersum est ut nunquam totam simul reperiatur."

¹⁸ See K. HANNEMANN, "Schedel", in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2. Auflage, ed. J. HÖFER – K. RAHNER, vol. 9, Freiburg, 1964, col. 376. The so-called *Schedelsche Weltchronik* was printed by Anton Koberger on 1493.07.12 at Nürnberg. For Helinand, see f. 206r: "Helinandus in territorio belluacensi (!) frigidi montis monachus his temporibus religione facundia ac doctrina clarus effulsit. qui cum esset vir doctissimus ac disertissimus. diligenti cura de omnibus rebus gestis chronicam perpulchram ab initio mundi vsque ad hec tempora composuit ac in maximo volumine digessit. At hoc opus ita dissipatum et dispersum est vt nusquam totum reperiatur. scripsit et alia opuscula et sermones." Incidentally, Schedel presents the earliest known portrait of Helinand, which he also uses, however, in the entries of Saint Johannes Gualbertus and Raimond of Peñafort!

¹⁹ For Trithemius' contribution to bibliography, see Th. BESTERMAN, *The Beginnings of Systematic Bibliography*, second edition, revised, London, 1940 [anst. repr. New York, 1968], pp. 6-10.

Helinand entry of his *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*²⁰ some data that he only could have discovered by reading other chapters of Vincent's *Speculum*.²¹ Trithemius enumerates four works by Helinand: the *Historiae* (i.e. the *Chronicon*), *De reparatione lapsi*, *Sermones* and *Epistulae ad diversos*, a new item that must be based, incorrectly, on Trithemius' study of the *Flores Helinandi*.²² Trithemius omitted the reference to Helinand's *Versus de morte* in the vernacular,²³ but implicitly included it, presumably, in the general reference "et alia plura". Unlike his medieval predecessors, the abbot of Sponheim supplies the incipit of the *Epistula de reparatione lapsi*: "G. lamentationes & ue", which proves that he read Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*. The most interesting novelty in Trithemius' note, however, is that he adds the number of books in the *Chronicon*, viz. 48.²⁴ This knowledge must be the fruit of a close reading of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, for when mentioning Helinand as his source, Vincent quite often adds the number of the book of Helinand's *Chronicon*. Although this *Chronicon* consists of 49 books, the last book explicitly referred to by Vincent is indeed book 48. This implies that in his hunt for material for his *De scriptoribus*, Trithemius studied Vincent's *Speculum Historiale* very seriously.

The Swiss scholar Conrad Gesner (1516-1565) abbreviates Trithemius' short note on Helinand in his *Bibliotheca Vniuersalis* of 1545.²⁵ He also calls him Helmandus and states that Helinand's *Chronicon* consists of 48 books. In his *Pandectae* of 1548 he correctly calls him Helinandus and places his acme around 1200.²⁶ Conradus Lycosthenes (Conrad Wolffhart,

²⁰ I used the Basle 1494 edition by Amerbach of Johannes TRITHEMIUS, *Liber de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*.

²¹ Trithemius misread Helinand's name and calls him Helmandus, a writing or reading mistake that is visible in bio-bibliographical literature until the seventeenth century!

²² The *Flores Helinandi* consist of two larger sets of excerpts made by Vincent from Helinand's *Chronicon* and the *Epistola de reparatione lapsi*, a letter that Helinand wrote to a former colleague Cistercian monk who had left the cloister. One of the set of excerpts was taken from Book 8 and is commonly known as *De cognitione sui*, the other was borrowed from Helinand's Book 11, ch. 38 and is presently referred to as *De bono regimine principis* (for this comprehensive excerpt, see M. GEERTSMA, "Helinand's *De Bono Regimine Principis*: A Mirror for Princes or An Exegesis of Deuteronomy 17, 14-20?", *Sacris Erudiri*, 52 (2013), pp. 385-414). Vincent appended these three texts to the bio-bibliographical chapter on Helinand in his *SH*, 29 (30), ch. 109-148.

²³ This omission was already noticed by Antoine L'Oisel, see below, pp. 361-362 and n. 40.

²⁴ *De scriptoribus* (see above, n. 20), fol. 62r: "Historiarum li. xlvij / De reparatione lapsi li. j G. lamentationes & ue. / Sermones plures li. j / Epistularum ad diuersos li. j/ Et alia plura / Claruit sub Heinrico sexto: Anno domini Millesimo CC."

²⁵ For Gesner's contribution to bibliography, see BESTERMAN, "The Beginnings" (above, n. 19), pp. 15-21.

²⁶ Conradus GESNERUS, *Bibliotheca Universalis sive Catalogus omnium scriptorum*, Zürich, 1545, f. 302v s.n. Helmandus: "Historiarum, lib. 48", and idem, *Pandectarum sive Partitionum*

1518-1561) compiled an unauthorized *Elenchus scriptorum omnium* from Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, which was published in 1551 at Basel. Apparently, he was not acquainted with Gesner's *Pandectae*, for he maintained the name Helmandus, mistakenly written by Gesner in 1545, but, as mentioned above, corrected in 1548. In addition, Lycosthenes introduced another mistake, for he erroneously associated Helinand with the year 1069 that Gesner had put in the margin next to the author Helpericus (the next entry after Helmandus in Gesner's *Bibliotheca*).²⁷ The Reformed theologian Josias Sim(m)ler, who made a supplement to the summary made by Lycosthenes from Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, speaks correctly about Helinandus, but also gives 1069 as the last year of Helinand's life.²⁸ At first glance, this might appear a harmless mistake, but this reading error would play a prominent role in the sale of one of the manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon* in the seventeenth century.²⁹

In Bellarminus' *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, published in 1613, we read, without any explanation, the incorrect information that Helinand's chronicle runs on to 1212.³⁰ Moreover, Bellarminus refers to Vincent and Saint Antoninus as intensive users of it.³¹ In 1639, the Antwerp scholar Miraeus slavishly follows him in this respect.³²

universalium ... libri XXI, Zürich, 1548 *s.n.* Helinandus: "Scripsit ab exordio mundi, usque ad suam aetatem 1200."

²⁷ For Conrad LYCOSTHENES / WOLFFHART, see J. BEYER, "Lycosthenes, Conrad", in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, ed. F.W. & T. BAUTZ, Vol. 23, Nordhausen, Westf., 2012, cols. 793-798. His *Elenchus scriptorum omnium, veterum scilicet ac recentiorum ... Ante annos aliquot à Clariss. uiro D. Conrado Gesnero Medico Tigurino editus, nunc uerò primùm in Reipublicae literariae gratiam in compendium redactus, & autorum haud poenitenda accessione auctus*, Basel, [1551], col. 386, *s.n.* Helmandus: "Claruit anno Domini 1069."

²⁸ Iosias SIMLERUS, *Appendix Bibliothecae Conradi Gesneri*, Zürich, 1555, f. 48v: *s.n.* Helinandus: "Claruit anno D. 1069."

²⁹ See below, pp. 377-378.

³⁰ In fact, the last year mentioned by Helinand in his *Chronicon* is 1204.

³¹ Robertus BELLARMINUS, *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Roma, 1613, p. 242: "De Helinando 1203. Helinandus Monachus Gallus scripsit historiam ab orbe condito vsque ad annum 1212. libris quadraginta octo, quem auctorem praecipue sequuti sunt Vincentius Bellouacensis, & sanctus Antoninus in historia scribenda. Scripsit etiam sermones, & epistolas, & alia, quae vtrum excusa extent, ignoro"; cfr SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 333. Sanctus Antoninus is Antonius or Antoninus Pierozzi (1389-1459), archbishop of Florence. He composed, i.e., a *Chronica* or *Summa Historialis*, that earned twenty editions from 1477 to 1740 (cfr A. WALZ, in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2. Aufl., ed. J. HÖFER – K. RAHNER, vol. 1, Freiburg, 1957, cols. 665-666).

³² Aubertus MIRAEUS (Le Mire), *Bibliotheca ecclesiastica sive nomenclatores VII. veteres*, Antwerpen, 1639, p. 257: "Helinandus, monachus ordinis Cisterciensis in Frigido Monte, diocesis Bellouacensis cœnobio, præter *Sermones & Epistolas*, scripsit *Historiam ab orbe condito ad sua tempora*, hoc est, usque ad annum Christi millesimum ducentessimum duodecimum. Ex Helinando multa hauserunt Vincentius Bellouacensis & S. Antoninus."

From this survey, it appears that until the second quarter of the seventeenth century the material on Helinand found in the works of the bio-bibliographers was exclusively derived from Vincent's chapter on Helinand and from the few additions that were the fruits of Trithemius' reading of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*.

4. *The Parisian Antiquaries and Helinand in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*

While the bio-bibliographers, who wrote for an international audience, were copying and re-copying Vincent of Beauvais' data about Helinand, serious progress was made on the Helinand research by two French historians, living at Paris or its larger surroundings, who were especially interested in the history and ancient customs of the French people: Claude Fauchet (1530-1602), a French lawyer, diplomat and historian who held a high-ranking official position at the royal court³³, and Antoine L'Oisel (1536-1617), a Parisian *avocat au Parlement* and public servant, who was very interested in the history of the Beauvaisis and a member of the circle of the intimate friends of Fauchet.

Claude Fauchet was a highly esteemed expert in French history and the history of French language and literature, who, in 1555, finished his second collection of selections from Old French texts. The first chapter of this collection is devoted to the medieval custom at noble courts of listening after dinner to poems sung with instrumental accompaniment.³⁴ Fauchet wanted to demonstrate, against the *Italianisants*, that this custom had already been in fashion for a long time at old French courts, and, thus was not recently imported from the Italian courts to France.³⁵ It is obvious that for him the originality of the French poetic genius and French court culture was at stake: French culture owed nothing to the Italians!³⁶ As

³³ For Fauchet, Antoine L'Oisel also known as Antoine Loysel, or less often Loisel and their relationship, see J.G. ESPINER-SCOTT, *Claude Fauchet. Sa vie, son œuvre*, Paris, 1938.

³⁴ J.G. ESPINER-SCOTT, *Documents concernant la vie et les œuvres de Claude Fauchet*, Paris, 1938, p. 149sqq.: "Second Livre des veilles ou observations en la lecture de plusieurs auteurs François par C.F.P. 1555. Matieres du Second Livre. Que antiennement les vers rimez de nos poëtes se chantoient au son des instrumentz. Chap. 1."

³⁵ ESPINER-SCOTT, *Documents*, p. 150: "Ainsi donq, lecteur, la coustume de chanter les vers (affin que je ne parle point du temps des Romains et Grecs) ne vient pas seulement des Italiens: mais nous est peculiere ou pour le moins commune avec eus."

³⁶ For the historical aspects of the anti-Italianist movement in sixteenth-century France, see L. SOZZI, "La polémique anti-italienne en France au seizième siècle", *Atti dell'Accademia delle Scienze di Torino*, 106 (1971-72), pp. 99-190 (repr. in idem, *Rome n'est plus Rome*, Paris, 2002, pp. 9-84), PH. DESAN, "Nationalism and History in France During the Renaissance",

proof, Fauchet adduces some lines from an Old French poem, now called the third *branche* of the *Roman d'Alexandre*, that describe how after dinner Alexander the Great called for 'Elinant' to sing for him and his company.³⁷ Elinant enters and sings about the struggle between the Gods and the Giants. In all probability, Fauchet was of the opinion that the author of this branch of the *Roman d'Alexandre* alluded to a custom at the court of Philippe Auguste. Although he knew that the Helinand mentioned by Vincent of Beauvais wrote a poem in Old French called *Vers de la mort*, it was not absolutely evident to him that the singer Elinant of the *Roman d'Alexandre* could be the same as Helinand of Froidmont nor that the anonymous *Vers de la mort* contained in the Ms Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, fonds français 1593, which was owned by Fauchet, was, in fact, the poem attributed by Vincent to Helinand of Froidmont.³⁸

The connection was made by Antoine L'Oisel. In 1594, L'Oisel published the first edition of Helinand's poem in print, based on Fauchet's manuscript. There was frequent mutual contact between the wealthy learned book collectors at Paris. They were acquainted with the contents of each other's libraries and they frequently exchanged books and manuscripts, as did Fauchet and L'Oisel.³⁹ A letter of dedication addressed to Fauchet precedes L'Oisel's edition of the *Vers de la mort* and is followed by an introduction in which he discusses Helinand's life and works, and in particular Helinand's authorship of the *Vers de la mort*. He was acquainted with Trithemius' omission of this poem from the survey of Helinand's works, but nevertheless felt confident attributing it to him on the strength of Vincent of Beauvais, whom he considered a more reliable authority on

Rinascimento, N.S. 24 (1984), pp. 261-288, and the more general study on anti-Italianism in medieval and early modern France by H. HELLER, *Anti-Italianism in Sixteenth-Century France*, Toronto-Buffalo-London, 2003.

³⁷ ESPINER-SCOTT, *Documents*, p. 150: "Quant le Roi ot mangié s'appella Helinant." For Branch III of the medieval French *Roman d'Alexandre*, see the Introduction and Notes by A. FOULET to *The Medieval French Roman d'Alexandre*, ed. E.C. ARMSTRONG, Vol. VI: *Version of Alexandre de Paris*, Princeton, 1976, pp. 1-21, and Foulet's note 348 on p. 76 to ll. 6017-23.

³⁸ ESPINER-SCOTT, *Claude Fauchet*, p. 206: "Helinand qui a écrit les *Vers de la Mort* est mentionné une fois dans les *Antiquitez* où Fauchet remarque qu'il a écrit après 1150 [in a note, Espiner-Scott refers to: f. 331v]. A côté de ce poème dans le manuscrit B.N. fr. 1593 f. 102, Fauchet met cette note: "Je ne scai si ces vers de la mort sont ceus de Helinand moine de Froidmont dont parle Vincent en son historial". For Fauchet's library and the present Ms Paris, BnF, fr. 1593, see also U.T. HOLMES – M.L. RADOFF, "Claude Fauchet and his Library", *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 44 (1929), pp. 229-242, esp. p. 230.

³⁹ ESPINER-SCOTT, *Claude Fauchet*, pp. 63-79: "Les amis de Fauchet," and pp. 289-290, where she speaks about the exchange of manuscripts.

this issue.⁴⁰ L'Oisel borrowed Helinand's biographical data and the anecdotes about his family and friends from Vincent's *Speculum*,⁴¹ but added a vague reference to Helinand's education in the school of Peter Abelard. This information is not found in Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*, but only in Book 48 of Helinand's *Chronicon*, where Helinand supplies a more detailed story about his education at Beauvais, even naming his supervisor, the English master Ralph.⁴² L'Oisel also suggests Pruneroy as his birthplace.⁴³ Thus L'Oisel identified Helinand as a more or less wandering *chanterre* and poet in Latin and French in the time of Louis VII and Philippe Auguste.⁴⁴ To support his view, he adduces, *inter alia*, the lines of the *Roman d'Alexandre* that Fauchet pointed to. In the introduction, he also tells us that he saw a volume of a work on history by Helinand in the library of the Parisian canon De Saint-André. L'Oisel also visited the library of Froidmont Abbey, where he saw some sermons by Helinand.⁴⁵ Strangely enough, he is completely silent about the existence of a manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* at Froidmont, although it seems likely that he not only saw this manuscript but read it, or learned from it about Helinand's education and his schoolmaster Ralph. For as far as we now know the Froidmont manuscript of the *Chronicon* was the only place in Paris and its surroundings, where this information about Helinand's youth could be found.

⁴⁰ L'OISEL, in the introduction to his edition of the *Vers de la mort par Dans Helynand, Religieux en l'abbaye de Froid-mont, Diocese de Beauvais, en l'an M. CC.* [without year of publication, but we know from L'Oisel's *Mémoires* (see below, n. 57) that this edition appeared in 1594], p. 4r: "Car ores qu'il ne soit comprins entre ses œuvres par Iean Abbé de Trittehan, si est-il nommé par Vincent de Beauvais, qui estoit son voisin & de temps, & de demeure, duquel l'ay transcit ce qui s'enfuit"

⁴¹ E.g., the name of his uncle Hellebaud and the story of his morning dispute with bishop Philippe de Dreux [cfr *Chronicon*, Book 8, chap. 9 that has been inserted by Vincent in Book 29 (30), chap. 116 of his *Speculum Historiale* as part of the *Flores Helinandi* (cfr above, n. 22)].

⁴² L'OISEL, *Vers de la mort* (above, n. 40), p. 2v: "Et semble qu'il pourroit bien auoir esté instruit en l'eschole de M.P. Abayelard: d'autant que ses escrits se ressentent aucunement: dont il est besoin que lon soit aduerty, affin d'y prendre garde." Actually, Helinand did not say that he was educated by Peter Abelard, but by a pupil and partisan of Abelard, Ralph of Beauvais. For Ralph of Beauvais' life and writings, see the Introduction to RALPH OF BEAUVAIS, *Liber Tytan*, ed. C.H. KNEEPKENS, Nijmegen, 1991, pp. ix-xxi.

⁴³ L'OISEL, *Vers de la mort* (above, n. 40), p. 2r: "natif du pais de Beauuois, & comme ie croy à Pruneroy".

⁴⁴ For a comprehensive discussion of Helinand as a possible jongleur at the Court of Philippe Auguste, see M.-G. GROSSEL, "Hélinand avant Froidmont: à la recherche d'un « trouvé » perdu", *Sacris Erudiri*, 52 (2013), pp. 319-352.

⁴⁵ L'OISEL says in the introduction on p. 4r: "Car i'en ay veu encores vn volume entre les liures de monsieur de saint André Chanoine de Paris: & quelques siens sermons en la Librairie de Froid-mont."

The Parisian canon in whose library L'Oisel saw a manuscript of the *Chronicon* was Jean de Saint-André. We know that the canon had several historical manuscripts in his large book collection. Alexandre Petau bought several manuscripts from this collection, and his father, Paul Petau, had already acquired some manuscripts from Jean de Saint-André's library before that.⁴⁶ Alexandre inherited his father's collection in 1614, and sold the majority of the manuscripts to Christina, the Queen of Sweden, in 1650. She, in turn, sold her collection of manuscripts to the Vatican Library in 1689 or 1690, where this former Saint-André manuscript, in which the books 1 to 18 of Helinand's *Chronicon* are preserved, is still kept with the call number *Reginensis latinus 535*.⁴⁷

Thus, a manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* turns up in the circles of Parisian learned manuscript collectors who were interested in French history and the old French language and literature. Fauchet would owe his elevation to nobility in 1586 to his expertise and book production in this field.⁴⁸ It is remarkable that the historians of the sixteenth century did not use Helinand's *Chronicon* as a historical source, although they were acquainted with the existence of manuscripts containing the books 1 to 18 (the Saint-André Ms) and 45 to 49 (the Froidmont Ms). This apparent indifference may be partly explained by pointing to the contents of books 1 to 18: they were not interested in Helinand's worldview, his theological historiography and compilatory method.⁴⁹ On the other hand, his *Vers de la mort* and the stories and anecdotes about French history in the *Flores Helinandi* in Vincent's *Speculum* did attract their attention.

So it appears that from the third quarter of the sixteenth century on, research was done on Helinand, and manuscripts containing his works were studied and collected by French antiquarians and Parisian book collectors, with special attention to Helinand as the author of the *Vers de la mort*. Whereas the general bio-bibliographers of the early modern period were unaware of the achievements of these nationally oriented French scholars,

⁴⁶ For Jean de Saint-André and the transfer of his library to Paul and Alexandre Petau, see K. A. DE MEYER, *Paul en Alexandre Petau en de geschiedenis van hun handschriften*, Leiden, 1947, pp. 188-189.

⁴⁷ For the history of the manuscript collection of Paul and Alexandre Petau, see DE MEYER, *Paul en Alexandre Petau*.

⁴⁸ ESPINER-SCOTT, *Claude Fauchet*, pp. 58-59.

⁴⁹ For Helinand's historiographical principles and methods, see M.M. WOESTHUIS, "Nunc ad historiam revertamur": History and Preaching in Helinand of Froidmont", *Sacris Erudiri*, 34 (1994), pp. 313-333 and E.L. SAAK, "The Limits of Knowledge: Hélinand de Froidmont's *Chronicon*", in *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts*. Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen, 1-4 July 1996, ed. P. BINKLEY, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1997, pp. 289-302.

Antoine L'Oisel shows that the Parisian learned circle were acquainted with the general bio-bibliographies.

5. *The Seventeenth-Century Cistercian Ressourcement Movement: De Visch and Tissier*

Both lines of research interest in Helinand, the general bio-bibliographers and the French antiquaries and bibliophiles, converged in the Cistercian bio-bibliography compiled by Karel De Visch († 1666), the Belgian prior of the Cistercian abbey of Ter Duinen in the vicinity of Bruges. De Visch's interest in Helinand arose from the *ressourcement* movement within the Cistercian Order, an effort at intellectual renewal that resulted from widespread feelings of dissatisfaction with the system of commendatory abbots, the dominance of the provincial structure within the administration of the Order, and, in particular, the internal conflict between the moderates and the friars who wanted to maintain or rather to revive strict observance.⁵⁰ Within the framework of the *ressourcement* movement, De Visch composed the *Bibliotheca scriptorum sacri ordinis cisterciensis*, a bio-bibliographical survey of all the authors of the Cistercian Order, which appeared in two editions.⁵¹

The first of these, published in 1649 at Douai, partly followed the general bio-bibliographical tradition. Vincent of Beauvais is De Visch's main authority on Helinand, and he also mentions, *inter alios*, the works by Trithemius, Bellarminus and Miraeus. On the other hand, a first reading shows that the Cistercian bio-bibliographers were even more important to him. The *Menologium Cisterciense* by the Spanish Cistercian scholar Crisóstomo Henríquez, who lived for many years in the Low Countries, appears to be his main source,⁵² and he also made firsthand use of the hand-written *Bi-*

⁵⁰ See E. MIKKERS, "La spiritualité cistercienne", in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité*, Paris, 1988, cols. 738-814, esp. col. 794.

⁵¹ Carolus DE VISCH, *Bibliotheca scriptorum sacri ordinis cisterciensis, elogiis plurimorum maxime illustrium adornata*, Douai, 1649; the second edition was published under the same title with the addition: *Editio secunda ab authore recognita, et notabiliter aucta; insertis et adiunctis, diversis opusculis Antiquorum Patrum Ordinis Cisterciensis*, Köln, 1656.

⁵² Chrysostomus HENRÍQUEZ, *Menologium Cisterciense notationibus illustratum*, Antwerpen, 1630, pp. 41-42, *ad Tertio Nonas Februarij*. For Henríquez as a Cistercian biographer, see G. BAURY, "Sainteté, mémoire et lignage des abbesses cisterciennes de Castille au XIII^e s.: La comtesse Urraca de Cañas (av. 1207-1262)", *Anuario de Estudios medievales*, 41 (2011), pp. 151-82; for Henríquez: *passim*. For Henríquez as an important source for De Visch, see DE VISCH, *Bibliotheca*, p. 129. For the role played by Henríquez in the Cistercian *ressourcement* movement in Spain and the southern Low Countries, see MIKKERS, "La spiritualité cistercienne" (above, n. 50), cols. 792-793.

bibliotheca Cisterciensis by Philippe Seguin, the prior of the Cistercian Abbey of Chaalis.⁵³ We must bear in mind, however, that these authors and their respective sources also based themselves on a reading of Vincent's chapter on Helinand's life and his *Flores Helinandi*. It is remarkable that the "young" De Visch and his Cistercian sources did not show any acquaintance with manuscripts of Helinand's works, nor any interest in the library of Froidmont. When De Visch mentions manuscripts of works by Helinand, he refers to texts that are part of Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*. Their research was bookish and tradition-based, and the Helinand research of the circle of the Parisian antiquaries was clearly no part of their scholarly horizon.

In the 1656 edition, the situation had changed completely. De Visch maintained the integral text of the 1649 edition, but he greatly enlarged the Helinand entry by adding new data on manuscripts of Helinand's works that stemmed from the Parisian antiquaries. In all probability, De Visch obtained access to this material through Philippe Labbe's *Nova Bibliotheca*, published in 1653,⁵⁴ for he refers to this work immediately after his 1649 text on Helinand. He claims that he learned from this work that a manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* was kept in the library of Queen Christina of Sweden, who acquired it in France:

[p. 141] Caeterum, post haec scripta, ad manus meas deuenit Bibliotheca noua librorum M. SS. Philippi Labbei, Societ. Iesu, in cuius primâ parte, author asserit Helinandi nostri chronicon extare in Bibliothecâ Reginae Sueciae, ex Gallijs eò delatum cum alijs pluribus antiquis codicibus M. SS.

Another new source for De Visch was a historical work on the Beauvaisis by Antoine L'Oisel, written in French and published in 1617, which devoted a chapter to Helinand that was, to a large extent, a copy of L'Oisel's introduction to his edition of the *Vers de la mort*.⁵⁵ L'Oisel's work sup-

⁵³ For Philippe Seguin or Philippus Seguinus and his hand-written texts and De Visch's acquaintance with Seguin's works, see BAURY, "Sainteté", p. 159. In the 1649 edition of his *Bibliotheca* (p. 129; in the 1656 edition, on p. 141), De Visch states that he had Seguin's hand-written *Bibliotheca* at his disposal: "denique Philippus Seguinus in suâ Bibliothecâ M.S. quam apud me habeo, verius eum appellari putat Helmundum: verum Helinandi vocabulum iam praevaluit. Post haec scripta, reperio Helinandum nostrum scripsisse. *Quosdam versus Gallicos de morte*

⁵⁴ PHILIPPUS LABBEUS, *Nova Bibliotheca MSS. Librorum sive Specimen Antiquarum Lectionum*, Paris, 1653, pp. 13-14: "Neque verò abs re fuerit ex Petauiano indice nonnullos hîc scriptores adiungere, qui lucem, quod sciam, nondum viderunt: Videbunt autem [p. 14] cûm visum fuerit serenissimæ succorum (!) Reginae CHRISTINAE, cuius instructissimam Bibliothecam cum alijs quam plurimis ornant hî quoque codices ex Galliâ nostrâ StolKolmium (!) deportati. Helinandi Monachi Frigidi montis Historia, libris octodecim ab initio mundi, nu. 14. & 32"; cfr SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 333.

⁵⁵ See above, n. 40.

plied De Visch with a reference to a manuscript of a historical work by Helinand (which De Visch called a “*volumen annalium*”) which L’Oisel had seen in the library of the Reverend de Saint-André, canon of Notre-Dame Cathedral in Paris.⁵⁶ What De Visch did not know is that the manuscript in the library of Queen Christina, which Labbe mentioned, was the same as the codex that was seen by L’Oisel at Paris. Moreover, De Visch learned from L’Oisel that he inspected a manuscript containing several sermons by Helinand in the abbey of Froidmont.⁵⁷ In addition to his introduction to the *Vers de la mort* edition, L’Oisel argues, in the *Memoires* of 1617, that Helinand was also the author of a Life of Saint Gereon and his co-martyrs that was edited by Laurentius Surius.⁵⁸ De Visch also inserted this new piece of information in the revised and enlarged edition of his *Bibliotheca*.⁵⁹

An important discovery concerning the manuscripts of Helinand’s *Chronicon* was made by Bertrand Tissier († 1672).⁶⁰ Tissier was the prior of the Cistercian abbey of Bonne-Fontaine in the present French department of the Ardennes, who, like De Visch, was involved in the Cistercian

⁵⁶ DE VISCH, *Bibliotheca* 1656, p. 141b: “Insuper: Antonius L’Oisel, in suis memorijs Beluacensibus Gallicè editis, scribit, se anno 1594. curasse imprimi, *Versus Gallicos Helinandi, de morte* (quos mitè extollit & laudat) præfixa epistola ad Dominum Fauchet [p. 142a] Asserit [sc. Ant. L’Oisel *CHKn*] se vidisse *volumen aliquod annalium Helinandi*, apud dominum Sancti Andreae, Canonicum Parisiensem. Item, *Sermones plures in Abbatia Frigidi montis*.”

⁵⁷ Antoine L’OISEL, *Memoires des Pays, Villes, Comté et Comtes, Evesché et Evesques, Pairrie, Commune, et Personnes de renom de Beauvais et Beauvaisis*, Paris, 1617, p. 201: “l’en [sc. de l’histoire d’Helinand *CHKn*] ay veu vn volume entre les livres du feu sieur Saint André Chanoine de Paris, & quelques siens sermons en l’Abbaye de Froidmont”; cfr SMITS, “Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text” (above, n. 2), p. 333, n. 43. In this entry, L’Oisel almost literally repeats the words from the introduction to his edition of Helinand’s *Vers de la mort* van 1594. The most important difference is that L’Oisel inserted the adjective ‘feu’; in 1594, he wrote: de monsieur de saint André.

⁵⁸ For a bio-bibliographical survey of the Carthusian hagiographer Laurentius Surius (Lorenz Sauer; * Lübeck 1523 – † Cologne 1578), see N. TRIPPEN, “Surius”, in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2. Auflage, ed. J. HÖFER – K. RAHNER, vol. 9, Freiburg, 1964, cols. 1193-1194. Surius edited the history of Saint Gereon and his companions of the Theban legion in vol. V of his *De probatis sanctorum historiis*, Köln, 1574, pp. 671-675. In the heading, Helinand is mentioned as the author of the Gereon *vita*, and Vincent of Beauvais as Surius’ source of this information (p. 671): “De SS. Gereone et alijs martyribus. Martyrium SS. Gereonis et sociorum eius, itemque Victoris, Cassii et Florentii, multorumque aliorum, auctore Helinando, teste Vincentio. Habetur in perantiquis MS. codicibus.”

⁵⁹ DE VISCH, *Bibliotheca* 1656, p. 142a: “6^o Asserit [sc. Ant. L’Oisel *CHKn*] Helinandum nostrum scripsisse quoque *Martyrium Sancti Gereonis, & Sociorum eius, quod vulgavit Surius tomo 5. dignum plane lectu, propter stylum longe excellentiorem quam in legendis aliorum Sanctorum*.”

⁶⁰ For Tissier, see Nicolas LE LONG, *Histoire ecclésiastique et civile du diocèse de Laon, et de tout le pays contenu entre l’Oise et la Meuse, l’Aisne et la Sambre*, Châlons, 1783, p. 266.

ressourcement movement.⁶¹ In the years from 1660 to 1669 he edited eight volumes containing texts by Cistercian authors.⁶² His motives for publishing these texts were that he wanted to restore the texts that had been falsely attributed to others, to their original authors, and, in particular, he wanted to inspire the monks “in these difficult times” to regain the spiritual fervour of their predecessors.⁶³ In the seventh volume of his *Bibliotheca*, Tissier edited the texts of Helinand that had been incorporated into Vincent’s *Speculum Historiale*, and, far more important, unedited texts written by Helinand that he had come across in the library of the Abbey of Froidmont.⁶⁴ Besides sermons and a treatise in the form of a letter, he found there – he uses the verb ‘*reperimus*’ and makes no reference to De Visch – the last part of Helinand’s *Chronicon*, viz. six complete quires and, as we will see below,⁶⁵ three separate leaves. These were quires 79 to 84, which cover the events of the years 634 to 1204. Tissier correctly concluded that this was the fourteenth part of the complete text of the *Chronicon*. He also assumed that he had discovered Helinand’s autograph⁶⁶. Unfortunately, he does not inform us about his reasons for reaching this conclusion.

Thus we see that the *ressourcement* historians of the Cistercian Order were interested in recovering Helinand’s *œuvre* from the glorious heyday of their Order in order to inspire their fellow brothers. During their general search for the “sources” of their Order, the manuscripts of part of Helinand’s *Chronicon* and of many of his sermons were rediscovered in Froidmont’s library, and these were edited together with the other Latin texts considered to be written by Helinand. The positive reception of Helinand’s *Chronicon* by his fellow Cistercians in the seventeenth century did not prevent nineteenth-century historians from expressing a negative verdict on Helinand’s historiographical abilities⁶⁷ and on Tissier’s editing

⁶¹ See MIKKERS, “La spiritualité cistercienne” (above, n. 50), col. 796.

⁶² Bertrand TISSIER, *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium sive Opera Abbatum et Monachorum Cisterciensis Ordinis, Qui seculo S. Bernardi, aut paulo post eius obitum floruerunt*, tt. 1-8, 1660-1669. The titles of the various volumes differ on minor points; furthermore, the place of publication is not always the same.

⁶³ This is a paraphrase of MIKKERS, “La spiritualité cistercienne” (above, n. 50), col. 796.

⁶⁴ Volume 7 was published in Paris in 1669 (see above, n. 1).

⁶⁵ See below, p. 373.

⁶⁶ TISSIER, *Bibliotheca* 7, 1669 (see above, n. 1), p. 231: “*Ejus Opera, quæ in ipso Frigidimontis Cænobio reperimus, scilicet ultimam partem, eamque quartamdecimam dumtaxat Chronici, quod olim extitit, (in autographo enim Authoris, quo usi sumus, hæc ultima pars inchoatur à quaternione 79. & terminatur in 84. desunt itaque 78. & solum supersunt 6).*”

⁶⁷ See, e.g., the negative judgment by M. BRIAL in his article “Hélinand, moine de Froidmont”, in *Histoire littéraire de la France*, t. 18, Paris, 1835, pp. 87-103, esp. pp. 93-94: “Quoi qu’il en soit, cette perte, si elle est réelle, n’est pas beaucoup à regretter, à en juger par le fragment qui nous reste, dans lequel notre auteur n’a fait que compiler ce qu’il a trouvé

skills.⁶⁸ Thus the period after 1700 saw little new appreciation for Helinand's work. It was only with Lehmann's positive approach to Helinand in the 1910s, and his acknowledgment of Helinand's importance as a source for Vincent of Beauvais, that the tide turned definitely back toward more favourable criticism.⁶⁹

6. *The Helinand Manuscripts and their History*

a. *The Manuscript at Froidmont*⁷⁰

After Tissier, the Premonstratensian Casimir Oudin (1638-1717)⁷¹ inspected the Froidmont manuscript during his search for source material for a history of his Order and the Gallican Church generally. In his *Supplementum de scriptoribus* of 1686, Oudin refers to the edition of Helinand's *Chronicon* by Tissier and writes that he borrowed this codex of the *Chronicon* during a stay at the Premonstratensian Abbey of Bucilly from 1679 to 1682, but that he – and this undoubtedly is a wink to bishop Guérin of Senlis – faithfully returned it to Froidmont: 'fideliter restitutum'.⁷² In

écrit avant lui. On s'attendrait à trouver, à cette époque, qui est celle de son âge mûr et de sa célébrité, une histoire instructive, nourrie de faits et d'aperçus politiques: point du tout, il n'a recueilli sur le XII^e siècle que des niaiseries; ses livres 48 et 49 ne sont remplis que de prodiges, de visions, de songes, d'apparitions, de revenants et d'autres puérités de ce genre. S'il touche, en passant, quelques événements publics, il n'en dit qu'un mot, sans en marquer les dates; et si celles qu'on lit à la marge sont de lui, et non de l'éditeur, elles sont presque toutes fausses. Le même désordre règne dans toute sa chronique. Concluons qu'Hélinand n'était pas né pour écrire l'histoire." Brial is followed by Hauréau in this respect: B. HAUREAU, "Hélinand", in *Nouvelle biographie générale*, t. 23, Paris, 1858, col. 817: "Nous souscrivons plus volontiers à l'avis de dom Brial, qui la considère comme dépourvue de toute utilité."

⁶⁸ See, e.g., L. DELISLE, "La chronique d'Hélinand, moine de Froidmont", in *Notices et documents publiés pour la Société de l'histoire de France à l'occasion du cinquantième anniversaire de sa fondation*, Paris, 1884, pp. 141-154, esp. pp. 141-142: "Jusqu'à présent la critique devait se contenter de l'édition très défectueuse des cinq derniers livres, que le Père Tissier a donnée en 1664 (!) dans le tome VII de la *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium*, et qui a été reproduite dans le tome CCXII de la Patrologie de Migne. ... Un seul exemple fera comprendre l'insuffisance de l'édition."

⁶⁹ See above, p. 354.

⁷⁰ My thanks go to the staff of the *Archives départementales de l'Oise*, Beauvais, for their kind and helpful support I received from them during my research visits at the *Archives*.

⁷¹ For Casimir Oudin, see R. DE CHARENTON, "Oudin (Remi)", in *La France protestante ou vies des protestants français*, ed. E. and É. HAAG, Paris, 1858, pp. 58-60; see L. KNAPPERT, "Oudin (Casimir)", in *Nieuw Nederlandsch Biografisch Woordenboek*, ed. P.C. MOLHUYSEN – P.J. BLOK – L. KNAPPERT, Leiden, 1921, cols. 411-412; A.F. MANNING, "Oudin, Remy Casimir", in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2. Auflage, ed. J. HÖFER – K. RAHNER, vol. 7, Freiburg, 1962, col. 1317.

⁷² Casimir OUDIN, *Supplementum de Scriptoribus vel Scriptis Ecclesiasticis a Bellarmino omissis, Ad annum 1460, vel ad Artem Typographicam inventam*, Paris, 1686, p. 483: "Scripsit

1722, an updated and enlarged version of this story appeared in which Oudin tells us that he had the opportunity to examine the manuscript during three weeks in his cell in Bucilly. He complains that it was written in a very small and faded handwriting that was difficult to read. One of his conclusions is that books 45 to 49 cannot represent only a fourteenth part of the complete chronicle. In this manuscript, Oudin grumbles, he only encountered lists of patriarchs, kings of Israel, Persia, the Medes, Assyrians, Romans and similar material covering the period from the creation of the world: these are names, but no history!⁷³ Oudin first surmised that this material represented the complete *Chronicon* of Helinand.⁷⁴ Towards the end of the section on the chronicle he added, however, that he had inspected the 1696 and 1698 catalogues of Sir Robert Cotton's library,⁷⁵ in which he read that the first item of the manuscript bearing the signature Claudius B.IX was the first part of the *Chronicon* composed by the monk Helinand, and that this first part covers the period from the creation of

Chronicon ad annum 1204 vel circiter, quod impressum novissimè extat in Bibliotheca veterum Scriptorum Ordinis Cisterciensis à Bertrando Tissier, cum aliquibus ejusdem Sermonibus erutis ex Autographo dicti Helinandi, quem penes me olim habui è Frigidomonte mutuatum, ac fideliter restitutum."

⁷³ CASIMIR OUDIN, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae antiquis illorumque scriptis tam impressis quam manuscriptis adhuc extantibus*, Leipzig, 1722, cols. 19-23: "Hoc autem Chronicon, cujus solum superesse ultimam partem conqueritur Bertrandus Tissier in *Preludiis* ad Opera Helinandi à se edita, eamque quartam decimam duntaxat *Chronici* quod olim extitit; opinor non esse verum, sed integrum ad nos pervenisse dicti Helinandi *Chronicon*. Nam Historia hæc, quæ adhuc extat in MS. originali, quod olim ad me ex Frigido Monte transmissum, fuitque per tres hebdomadas in cellula mea, dum Buciliaci manerem: aliud nihil est, quam nonnullæ tabulæ diversarum successionum, ut *Patriarcharum*, *Regum Israël*, *Persarum*, *Medorum*, *Assyriorum*, *Romanorum*, & aliorum ejusmodi, ab initio mundi: quæ sola ferè nomina continent, nihil autem historicum, vixque ab oculatissimis & attentissimis, ob characteris parvitatem & attritionem legi possunt."

⁷⁴ OUDIN, *Commentarius* 1722, cols. 21-22: "Inspecta autem attentius & in otio, Historia *Helinandi Monachi* quæ ad annum 1203. excurrit originali, illam puto 48. libris scriptam fuisse: cujus prima pars Libris sexdecim summatim, ut supra diximus, per solas ferè nomenclaturas *De rebus ab orbe condito*, ad Darii Nothi tempora ageret: secunda libris totidem vel sequentium temporum paulò latius ad Christi nativitatem complecteretur: tertia libris 12. à Christo nato ad annum 636. quarta ulti/col. 22/morum temporum libris quatuor &c. quæ sola utilis visa, prælo data est. Ita quidem ex allato ad me Originali ipsius Helinandi è Frigidi Montis Abbatia ad Buciliensem in Therascia Ordinis Præmonstratensis."

⁷⁵ For concise information about Cotton and his collection of manuscripts, see Seymour DE RICCI, *English Collectors of Books & Manuscripts (1530-1930) and Their Marks of Ownership*, Bloomington, 1960 [repr. from ed. Cambridge, UP, 1930], p. 24; for Oudin and his being aware of the existence of the Cottonian manuscript of Helinand's chronicle, see also SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 334.

the world to the times of Darius Nothus and Archelaus.⁷⁶ This compelled him to question his earlier conjecture that the Froidmont manuscript contains the complete text of the *Chronicon*. But he did not pursue this line of reasoning to its conclusion.

After Oudin, the interest of European scholarship in the Froidmont manuscript of Helinand's chronicle faded. Within the framework of the historical research of the Maurists, the learned Benedictines Edmond Martène and Ursin Durand made "*un voyage littéraire*" through France in 1718, searching for texts and manuscripts, and also visited Froidmont. In the library they were shown some manuscripts, the most important of which were the chronicle by Helinand and some *Lives* of saints.⁷⁷

To date, we know that the manuscript that was shown to Martène and Durand was not in the same condition in which Tissier had found it about forty years earlier. Étienne de Nully, a canon of the cathedral of Beauvais who was deeply interested in local history, and the theologian and church historian Godefroi Hermant (1617-1690), who was banished from Paris to his birthplace of Beauvais for alleged Jansenist ideas, visited the abbey of Froidmont around 1680, and tried to read the manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon*, but the crabbed handwriting was a practical obstacle to becoming seriously acquainted with the contents of the texts. They earnestly recommended to the monks, however, to have the *Helinandiana* bound,

⁷⁶ OUDIN, *Commentarius*, col. 22: "Verum lectis Catalogis MSS. Codicum Bibliothecarum Angliæ, qui annis 1696. & 1698. duobus in folio tomis Oxonii prodierunt, conjecturæ meæ in hoc pertimui, ne falsa vel incerta esset. Nam in Catalogo MSS. Codd. Cottonianæ Bibliothecæ pag. 40. col. 2. litera Claudius B. Codice IX. num. 1, legitur *Chronicorum Helinandi Monachi, Ordinis Cisterciensis, pars prima à creatione mundi ad tempora Darii Nothi & Archelai, libris sexdecim*. Atque Codex optimæ notæ videtur, nec procul ab ætate Helinandi conscriptus." – Oudin's note is not clear in every respect. Only one catalogue of the Cottonian MSS was published, viz. the catalogue edited by Thomas SMITH that appeared in 1696: *Catalogus Librorum Manuscriptorum Bibliothecæ Cottonianæ*, Oxford, 1696 (see also: T.C. SKEAT, *The British Museum. Catalogues of the Manuscript Collections*, Revised ed., London, 1962, p. 10). Furthermore, in Smith's description of the MS Claudius. B. IX (on p. 40b) no dating or qualification of this codex is found: "IX. 1. *Chronicorum Helinandi Monachi, ordinis Cisterciensis, pars prima: a creatione mundi ad tempora Darii Nothii & Archelai; libris sedecim*.", whereas Oudin explicitly refers to the excellent quality and the time of realisation of the manuscript.

⁷⁷ Edmond MARTÈNE & Ursin DURAND, *Voyage littéraire de deux religieux benedictins de la Congregation de Saint Maur*, Paris, 1717, seconde partie, p. 158: "Nous restâmes quinze jours à Beauvais, pendant lesquels nous fûmes à l'abbaye de Froidmont ... Il [sc. le prieur de Froidmont *CHKz*] nous fit voir dans la bibliothèque (!), dont les vitres peintes sont tres-belles, quelques manuscrits. Les principaux sont la chronique d'Helinand religieux de Froidmont; les vies de saint Bernard, de saint Pierre de Tarentaise, de saint Thomas de Cantorberie, & des Peres du désert."

which was done in one volume "in quarto".⁷⁸ This implies that before the visit of De Nully and Hermant the Helinand manuscript material was kept in unbound state in the library of Froidmont.

The vicissitudes of the library of Froidmont Abbey during the French Revolution are only broadly known. No pre-Revolution catalogues or inventories are known.⁷⁹ An inventory of the contents of the library of the Abbey of Froidmont was made on 5 September 1790 under the terms of the first sequestration of ecclesiastical possessions. The official report is very concise and only speaks of 950 books, of which twenty were manuscripts with a strictly liturgical and religious function.⁸⁰ No manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* is mentioned. In all probability, as we will see below, it had already been removed from the library before the inventarisation took place. In 1791, the abbey's buildings with their contents were publicly sold. In secondary literature, no reference is found to official reports of a transfer of manuscripts, books or archives to the principal town of the department, i.e. Beauvais, or to the canton's capital. In her survey of the Cistercian libraries of medieval France, Anne Bondéelle-Souchier was able to attribute only five manuscripts to Froidmont. Three of these have been preserved: two liturgical manuscripts and a twelfth-century codex of Jerome's letters. Two manuscripts are listed as lost: the manuscript of Helinand's chronicle and sermons, and the codex containing the Lives of saints mentioned by Martène and Durand.⁸¹ In the entry on Helinand in the *Biographie Universelle*, Charles Weiss states

⁷⁸ M. l'abbé RENET (Pierre R.C. Renet) summarizes De Nully's report of the visit that he and Hermant made to Froidmont in 1680, in his: "Saint Hélinand", *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts du Département de l'Oise*, 14/3 (1891), pp. 857-72, esp. pp. 868-69. Renet relies on the handwritten *Mémoires* of De Nully: "ET. DE NULLY signalait aussi des fragments manuscrits de la Chronique de S. Elinand. «Ces fragments d'Elinand, qui sont restés à Froidmont sont présentement reliés, disait le chanoine de Beauvais [sc. Étienne de Nully *CHKn*], en un in-4°, par mes instances auprès des Religieux, mes amis, mais d'une si mauvaise écriture, que feu M. Hermant [† 1690 *CHKn*] et moy avec luy, nous n'avons pu déchiffrer que très peu de choses». [This notice is followed by the description of the MS.] Voilà qui nous représente fort bien cet amas d'écrits reliés en 1680, sur l'avis d'Etienne de Nully."

⁷⁹ See A. BONDÉELLE-SOUCHIER, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes dans la France médiévale. Répertoire des abbayes d'hommes*, Paris, 1991, pp. 119-21.

⁸⁰ Beauvais, *Archives départementales de l'Oise*, 1Q II 1541: "Sommes entré dans la Bibliothèque ou nous avons reconnu / six rayons de tablettes tous au pourtour excepté du coté de la / croisée et sur icelles environ neuf cent cinquante volumes, de différents formats tant reliés que brochés y compris vingt manuscrits qui sont livres d'Eglise ou à l'usage des religieux."

⁸¹ BONDÉELLE-SOUCHIER, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes*, p. 121.

that the Froidmont manuscript of the *Chronicon* had disappeared by the early nineteenth century.⁸²

Nevertheless, it is certain that the manuscript of Helinand's chronicle survived the disturbances of the French Revolution. In 1868, Deladreu published an essay on the history of Froidmont Abbey, and stated that the manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* was lost. On the next page, however, he mentions in a footnote that he saw a Froidmont manuscript dating from the beginning of the 13th century that contains books 45 to 49 of Helinand's *Chronicon*, written a small, crabbed handwriting.⁸³ It was in the possession of the Reverend Pierre-Constant Barraud (1804-1874), a canon of Beauvais, professor at the *Grand Séminaire* of Beauvais, and a scholar of supra-regional reputation, who published several studies on Christian architecture and the history of the Beauvaisis. It is uncertain how Barraud came into possession of this manuscript. He was a son of Hugues Barraud, who served as secretary to the last bishop of Beauvais of the *Ancien Régime*, François-Joseph de La Rochefoucauld-Bayers⁸⁴ and was deeply interested in the local history of the Beauvaisis. It is remarkable that the Reverend Barraud himself never mentioned a manuscript that was so important for the history of the Beauvaisis, but apparently showed it, some years before his death, to Deladreu.⁸⁵ Perhaps Barraud left this manuscript to the *Grand Séminaire* of Beauvais, for in 1883 the Reverend Canon P.R.C. Renet

⁸² [Ch.] WEISS, "Hélinand", in *Biographie Universelle, ancienne et moderne*. Ouvrage ... rédigé par une société de gens de lettres et de savants. Tome vingtième, Paris, 1817, pp. 4^a-5^b, esp. p.5^a: "Le manuscrit original, qui était conservé à l'abbaye de Froidmont, a disparu."

⁸³ L.-E. DELADREUE, "Notice sur l'abbaye de Froidmont (Ordre de Cîteaux)", *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts du Département de l'Oise*, 7 (1868), pp. 469-624, on p. 526: "Le manuscrit original, qui était conservé à l'abbaye de Froidmont, a disparu." – In footnote (1) on p. 528 Deladreu writes: "M. l'abbé Barraud, chanoine de Beauvais, possède un ancien manuscrit de l'abbaye de Froidmont, qui contient les livres XLV à XLIX de la chronique d'Hélinand, plusieurs de ses sermons, des dissertations sur l'époque de la venue de Jésus-Christ, et des commentaires sur l'Écriture-Sainte. Ce manuscrit, d'une écriture fine et serrée, appartient au commencement du XIII^e siècle. Il nous paraît à peu près certain que c'est celui qu'ont vu D. Baunier [sc. Beaunier *CHKn*], Tissier et Oudin, et d'après l'inspection du caractère de l'écriture et de la disposition du texte, nous serions assez porté à croire que c'est le manuscrit original d'Hélinand."

⁸⁴ For François-Joseph de La Rochefoucauld, see CH. DELETTRE, *Histoire du diocèse de Beauvais depuis son établissement, au 3^{me} siècle, jusqu'au 2 septembre 1792*, Vol. 3, Beauvais, 1843, pp. 545-554, and St. SKALWEIT, "La Rochefoucauld", in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2. Auflage, ed. J. HÖFER – K. RAHNER, vol. 6, col. 800.

⁸⁵ For a biography of Barraud and a survey of his publications, see P.-N. DANJOU, "Notice biographique sur l'abbé Barraud, Chanoine de la Cathédrale de Beauvais", *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts du Département de l'Oise*, 9 (1874), pp. 147-156, and L. PIHAN, *Notice biographique d'un Archéologue du Département de l'Oise. M. le Chanoine Barraud*, Beauvais, 1893.

(1826-1908), who also was attached to the *Grand Séminaire* and interested in local and regional history,⁸⁶ informed Léopold Delisle, the director of the *Bibliothèque nationale* at Paris, about the existence of this manuscript, which according to Delisle was in the possession of the *Grand Séminaire*. Accordingly, Delisle devoted a detailed study to it in 1884, in which he asserts that the manuscript in question belonged to ('appartient au') the *séminaire de Beauvais*.⁸⁷

Here, I restrict myself to reproducing only some salient points from Delisle's article. As mentioned above, the manuscript was bound towards the end of the 17th century.⁸⁸ At the time Delisle examined the Helinand codex, it consisted of nine codicologically independent parts. The first part consists of four quires of eight leaves each and three added leaves, together 35 leaves, and contains the text covering the years 877 to 1204 of the *Chronicon*. On f. 24v the signature 83 (written in Roman numerals) is found, and on f. 32v the signature 84, also in Roman numerals. This implies that the last three leaves were added, but were also part of the original manuscript, for the text does not suffer from any break, and on f. 35r, the *Explicit* of the *Chronicon* was written: "Expliciunt cronica Elinandi". The quires 79 and 80, which Tissier still had at his disposal,⁸⁹ were lost in the meantime. Since the leaves of the first part are foliated 1 to 35, and Delisle did not observe any trace of removal of leaves or quires, we may safely conclude that the two quires disappeared somewhere in the last three decades of the 17th century before the manuscript was bound.⁹⁰ Delisle's description of the size of the manuscript and the handwriting is also of interest. The first part, which contains the chronicle, measures 26 cm by 18 cm, and the handwriting is described as, in general, small and dense.⁹¹ We will need these codicological and paleographical data as soon as we discuss the two other manuscripts of the *Chronicon*. In 1891, Renet published his article titled "*Saint Helinand*", in which he also gives a general description of the Froidmont-Beauvais manuscript and silently corrects a typing

⁸⁶ For the life of the Reverend Renet, see L. PIHAN, "M. l'Abbé Renet. Sa vie.- son œuvre (1826-1908)", *Mémoires de la Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences & Arts du Département de l'Oise*, 20/2 (1908), pp. 249-300.

⁸⁷ DELISLE, "La chronique" (above, n. 68), p. 142: "Ce manuscrit appartient au séminaire de Beauvais et m'a été communiqué le 23 août 1883 par M. l'abbé Renet."

⁸⁸ See above, pp. 370-371.

⁸⁹ See above, pp. 366-367.

⁹⁰ See above, pp. 370-371.

⁹¹ DELISLE, "La chronique" (above, n. 68), p. 142: "L'écriture est généralement très serrée; on y reconnaît le travail de plusieurs scribes de la première moitié du XIII^e siècle."

or reading error made by Delisle. This leads to the assumption that Renet must have had access to the manuscript at that time.⁹²

In 1913, the contents of the former libraries of the Great Seminary and the Preparatory Seminary and the *Bibliothèque de la ville de Beauvais* were combined and housed in the old town hall of Beauvais.⁹³ Considering Delisle's remark that the Froidmont manuscript belonged to the *Grand Séminaire*, one would expect that it was moved over to the new housing, but that does not seem very plausible. It is even questionable whether it was ever in the possession of the *Grand Séminaire*. In his 1891 article on "Saint Helinand", Renet discussed the Froidmont-Beauvais manuscript of Helinand's chronicle. It is striking that nowhere in this article he mentions a present depository of the manuscript. Instead, he only refers to the last owner, Barraud, who had died in 1874.⁹⁴

As a consequence of the Law of 9 December 1905, the possessions of the *Grand Séminaire* were sequestered and ordered to be turned over to a public institution or cultural institution of public interest. In the first week of February 1906, an inventory was drawn up of the library of the *Grand Séminaire* by Mr. Ernest Roussel, the keeper of the archives of the *Département de l'Oise*. His inventory contains several liturgical manuscripts, but one looks in vain for a reference to the manuscript of Helinand's chronicle, which without any doubt would have been recognised by the archivist.⁹⁵ This implies that the Reverend Renet is the last person who we know had the Froidmont-Beauvais codex at his disposal. Renet bequeathed the famous collection Bucquet-Aux Cousteau, a collection of documents of paramount importance to the history of the Beauvaisis, to the city of Beauvais; it consisted of 95 volumes and was kept in the city's Public Library.⁹⁶ His working library was bequeathed to the *Société Académique de l'Oise*. Pihan appended an inventory of it to his biography of Renet, but no entry refers to Helinand's chronicle.⁹⁷

⁹² RENET, "Saint Hélinand" (above, n. 78), p. 868, where Renet correctly gives the folios of the sixth section of the Froidmont manuscript, viz. f. '78-85', instead of Delisle's reading error 'f. 76-85'.

⁹³ JEAN BLETON, "Les nouvelles bibliothèques municipales de Douai et de Beauvais", url: <http://bbf.enssib.fr/consulter/bbf-1957-05-0363-001>: "les bibliothèques du grand et du petit séminaire venaient en effet d'être attribuées à la ville. Commencés l'hiver 1911-1912, les travaux furent achevés en décembre 1913 et la nouvelle bibliothèque ouverte le 22 janvier suivant."

⁹⁴ RENET, "Saint Hélinand" (above, n. 78), p. 868: "C'est apparemment le manuscrit, qui est venu en ces derniers temps, en la possession du Chanoine Barraud."

⁹⁵ The inventory is kept in the *Archives départementales de l'Oise* under the signature 1 V 568.

⁹⁶ It seriously suffered from the fire in 1940.

⁹⁷ PIHAN, "M. l'Abbé Renet" (above, n. 86), pp. 296-299.

At the meeting of April 1920 of the *Société Académique* of the *département de l'Oise*, the chairman, Dr Victor Leblond, read a letter from the distinguished medievalist Ferdinand Lot, inquiring about the recent history and the present location of this manuscript.⁹⁸ No comments or reaction to this letter is known. In June 1940, the library of Beauvais went up in flames due to the devastation of the old town hall by German bombing.⁹⁹ This does not imply, however, that on that occasion the manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* was also burnt. It is very probable that this manuscript, like much of the manuscript patrimony of France, is still in private possession. Perhaps the same holds for the two quires that disappeared towards the end of the 17th century.

b. *The Manuscript of Beaupré: From Beaupré over Paris to the Vatican Library*

In outline, the history of the Vatican manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* (the present Ms Vat. Reg. 535) may be quickly told. It contains the first 18 books of the second version of the *Chronicon*.¹⁰⁰ It is a luxury codex in great folio format. The first chapter of each book is embellished with large illuminated initials. The capitals of the other chapters, the chapter titles, and marginal notes are in red, blue, black-brown or dark green. Its origin is dated, on palaeographical grounds, to the first quarter of the 13th century.¹⁰¹ From inscriptions of ownership it appears that, in the 14th and 15th centuries, the manuscript was in the possession of the Cistercian Abbey of Beaupré in the diocese of Beauvais.¹⁰² The library of this abbey must have

⁹⁸ *Société Académique d'Archéologie, Sciences et Arts du département de l'Oise. Compte rendu des séances 1920*, Beauvais, 1920: "Séance du 19 avril. Présidence de M. le Docteur Leblond président ... Le Président communique une lettre de M. Ferdinand Lot, professeur à la Sorbonne, demandant ce qu'est devenu le manuscrit de la *Chronique d'Helinand*, conservé jadis au Grand Séminaire de Beauvais et signalé, en 1883, par l'abbé Renet à Léopold Delisle, qui en a publié une étude dans les *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de France*. Ce manuscrit avait appartenu, avant 1870, au chanoine Barraud."

⁹⁹ See BLETON, "Les nouvelles bibliothèques" (above, n. 93): "Pratiquement, la bibliothèque qui fut détruite le 8 juin 1940 et où logeaient près de 42.000 volumes était celle que nous venons de décrire rapidement."

¹⁰⁰ See above, p. 353.

¹⁰¹ M.-P. ARNAULD-CANCEL, "Le huitième livre" (above, n. 3), p. 11: "L'écriture paraît être de la première moitié du XIII^e siècle; SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 334: "The manuscript dates from the first quarter of the thirteenth century."

¹⁰² BONDEILLE-SOUCHIER, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes* (above, n. 79), p. 23. On f. 0vb the following (faded) text can be discerned: "Iste liber est de monasterio / Beate marie de bello prato" written by a late medieval hand (14/15th c.); on the verso side of the last folio, a late-fifteenth-century hand has written: "Iste Liber pertinet ad monasterium / Beate marie de bello prato Cystercien / ordinis Beluacen dioc."

possessed an interesting and rich collection of manuscripts, as is evident from the catalogues and the long list of manuscripts that were once owned by this abbey and are still preserved.¹⁰³

In all probability, the Helinand manuscript was part of the library of the famous manuscript collector, Paul Petau, as may be deduced from the number "M. 43" in the right upper corner of the recto side of the first folio.¹⁰⁴ As recounted above, his son, Alexandre, who inherited his father's collection in 1614, sold the majority of the manuscripts of his library to Queen Christina of Sweden in 1650.¹⁰⁵ The history of this manuscript in the middle of the sixteenth century, when it was in the library of Jean de Saint-André, and the first decades of the seventeenth century, when it was in the possession of the family Petau, has been described above, but the part of its history between its presence in late-fifteenth-century Beaupré and its appearance in the collection of Jean de Saint-André remains completely obscure. The only observation that can be made is that in all probability in that period, or earlier, ten of the eighteen illuminated initials were cut out. It does not seem likely that this damage was done by either modern manuscript leaf-sellers or other vandals, or sixteenth-century manuscript collectors; the former would have cut out them all to begin with the most beautiful one, viz. the initial of the first book, the latter cared for their manuscripts too much.¹⁰⁶ In all probability, this damage was the result of monastic piety. More than once, illuminated manuscripts that were no longer popular or in use, were stripped of their beautiful initials to glue these onto manuscripts that served a higher aim, e.g. the liturgy.¹⁰⁷

c. The Cottonian Manuscript: Saunder, John Dee and King's Hall

The generally known history of the present London manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* (MS London, BL, Cotton, Claudius B IX) is that it was part of the library of Sir Robert Bruce Cotton (1571-1631), one of the greatest manuscript collectors of his time. Together with the complete Cottonian collection, it was granted to the English nation by his grandson in 1700. In 1753, the Cottonian library was incorporated into the British Museum, which was founded in the same year. The Cotton manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* is smaller than the Beaupré manuscript, but larger

¹⁰³ See BONDÉELLE-SOULCHIER, *Bibliothèques cisterciennes*, pp. 20 and 22-23.

¹⁰⁴ See DE MEYER, *Paul en Alexandre Petau* (above, n. 46), pp. 29-30.

¹⁰⁵ See above, p. 363.

¹⁰⁶ For this criminal kind of intentional damage to manuscripts, see R. CLEMENS and T. GRAHAM, *Introduction to Manuscript Studies*, Ithaca and London, 2007, pp. 114-115.

¹⁰⁷ For other examples of this pious Philistinism, see H. KIENHORST, *Rijkdom in eenvoud*, Rotterdam, 2005, p. 65.

than the Froidmont codex;¹⁰⁸ it is carefully executed, but more sober and less colorful than the Beaupré manuscript. It also has fewer marginal notes. Unlike the Beaupré manuscript, in which the books 1-18 of a later redaction have been preserved, the London codex only contains the books 1 to 16 of an early version of Helinand's *Chronicon*.¹⁰⁹

It was offered to Sir Robert Cotton by Sir Nicholas Saunder or Saunders "of Ewell" in a letter of 30 November 1621.¹¹⁰ Saunder describes it as a history written by the Cistercian monk Helinandus, who according to Simler's *Bibliotheca* lived in 1069,¹¹¹ that is, in the time of William the Conqueror. Saunder seems to have had some historical interests, and he wrote papers about historical subjects. In all probability, however, he acquired this manuscript through theft, stealing it from the library of John Dee in Mortlake in 1583 or 1584 during Dee's stay on the continent.¹¹²

John Dee was the prototype of the humanistic universal scholar, but was also a somewhat enigmatic person. Dee was born in London in 1527 to a family of Welsh origin. At the age of fifteen, he matriculated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he earned his B.A. At the foundation of Trinity College in 1546, he moved over to this college. Although a man of general intellectual curiosity, he showed special interest in mathematics, alchemy and astrology,¹¹³ but also paid attention to historical works that are part of the historical patrimony of Tudor England and the recently founded Anglican Church.

In the inventory or catalogue that Andreas Fremonsheim drew up by order of John Dee in 1583, the manuscript of Helinand's chronicle appears as number 92 and is described as follows: "Helmandi Monachi, chronicon Mundi libri xxx. hoc est, pars prima. pergameno. folio".¹¹⁴ The mean-

¹⁰⁸ To make a comparison easier: the Beaupré MS (Vat. Reg. 535) measures 41.4 × 30.3 cm, the Froidmont Ms. 26 × 18 cm, and the Cotton MS (BL, Cotton, Claudius B IX) 32 × 25.5 cm, which is a substantial size for a manuscript.

¹⁰⁹ See above, p. 353.

¹¹⁰ For Sir Nicholas Saunder and his relationship to John Dee, see J. ROBERTS & A.G. WATSON, *John Dee's Library Catalogue*, London, 1990, 50-52; for John Dee, see R. Julian ROBERTS, "Dee, John", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. H.C.G. MATTHEW – B. HARRISON, Oxford, 2004, pp. 667-675.

¹¹¹ For Sim(m)ler, see above, p. 359.

¹¹² ROBERTS & WATSON, *John Dee's Library*, p. 49 (above, n. 110).

¹¹³ For Dee's role in the Elizabethan intellectual movement, see J.A. VAN DORSTEN, *The Radical Arts. First Decade of an Elizabethan Renaissance*, 2nd edition, Leiden-Oxford, 1973, pp. 21-25.

¹¹⁴ For Andreas Fremonsheim and the role he played in drawing up the inventory of Dee's books in Mortlake in 1583, see ROBERTS "Dee, John" (above, n. 110), p. 673 and ROBERTS & WATSON, *John Dee's Library*, pp. 12-13. This catalogue is preserved in the manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College, O.iv. 20. An edition of the part that lists the manuscripts is

ing of the three “x”-s here is uncertain. In all probability, we are confronted with reading error by Fremonsheim. In the Harleian manuscript now kept in the British Library bearing the call number 1879, one finds two library inventories of John Dee’s library at Mortlake, one of the printed books, the other of the manuscripts, both personally drawn up by John Dee. A note at the top of the manuscripts inventory states that he started the inventory on 6 September 1583. On f. 100verso (old 82verso) one can read, with some effort, “*Helmandi Monachi Cistariensis* [corrected to “Cisterciensis”]; in the title on the recto-side of f. 1 of the Cottonian manuscript, one also reads, however, “Cistariensis] *Chroni / corum mundi libri*” followed by a number in Roman numerals, at first glance consisting of three “x”-s, but after closer examination one can also read “xvj” or “xvy”; the concluding part of the entry reads: “*hoc est prima pars folio pergameno*” (and not “*pars prima pergameno folio*” as in Fremonsheim catalogue). Accordingly, the whole entry of Dee’s 1583 catalogue reads, in uncorrected state, as follows: “*Helmandi monachi Cistariensis Chronicorum mundi libri xvj* [or: xvij or xxx] *hoc est prima pars folio pergameno*”. This would mean that Dee did not have a Helinand codex containing thirty books, but only the sixteen books that are still preserved in the Cottonian codex. Furthermore, he knew that it was the first part, and, accordingly, that another part or parts were missing.

It is not clear why Dee included the manuscript of the first part of Helinand’s *Chronicon* in his library, for it has little to say about English history. Perhaps it was more important to him that Helinand paid attention to astronomy, astrology, geodesy and meteorology, issues in which Dee particularly was interested, but this is only a guess. Dee’s stay in Trinity College in Cambridge might have given him the opportunity to acquire this manuscript, for it appears to have a Cambridge history.

In Ker’s survey of the medieval libraries of Great Britain, King’s Hall in Cambridge is said to be the medieval provenance of this manuscript.¹¹⁵ King’s Hall, founded by Edward III in 1337, and the neighbouring Michael House, were amalgated by Henry VIII in 1546 in a new foundation, Trinity College, Dee’s new college.¹¹⁶ In his article on the library of King’s Hall, Sayle shows that the library of King’s Hall regularly received grants

edited by J. O. HALLIWELL in *The Private Diary of Dr. John Dee, and the Catalogue of his Library of Manuscripts*, Camden Society & London, 1842 [anast. repr. New York & London, 1968]; a facsimile edition of the 1583 catalogue is found in ROBERTS & WATSON, *John Dee’s Library*.

¹¹⁵ N.R. KER, *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain. A List of Surviving Books*, Second edition, London, 1964, p. 26.

¹¹⁶ For King’s Hall, zie Alan B. COBBAN, *The King’s Hall within the University of Cambridge in the Later Middle Ages*, Cambridge, 1969, and G.M. TREVELYAN, *Trinity College. An Historical Sketch*, Cambridge, 2001, pp. 11-21

and donations from the royal court that often consisted of one or more books.¹¹⁷ A large donation was given in 1435 by King Henry VI, who granted 77 volumes, of which the last three taken together made up a complete copy of Helinand's *Chronicon*. An official inventory of this donation was drawn up, in which the first one or two words of the recto-side of the second leaf of each volume donated were written as a means to identify the manuscripts. According to this donation list, the first two words of the second folium of the first volume of Helinand's *Chronicon* are "peritos esse", which are the same as the first words of the recto-side of the second folium of the Cottonian Helinand manuscript.¹¹⁸ This is a decisive proof that the Cottonian manuscript once formed part of the library of King's Hall, and that it entered King's Hall in 1435. The donation of 1435 also is mentioned in two entries in the *Kalendars of the Treasury of the Exchequer*. Sayle summarizes both the entries and inserts between them the words "Liber Chronicorum Helinandi", which do not appear, however, in Palgrave's edition of the *Antient Kalendars*. In the first entry dating from 3 July 1435, it is said that two books of chronicles recently came into the possession of the late King Henry V (*Domini Henrici nuper Regis Anglie quinti post Conquestum*) by the agency of (or as a gift from) William Constable.¹¹⁹ If one of the Chronicles mentioned in the first entry is indeed

¹¹⁷ C.E. SAYLE, "King's Hall Library", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Cambridge, 24 (1923), pp. 54-76.

¹¹⁸ For the list, see Sayle, "King's Hall Library", pp. 71-72. The last three parts of the list are: "Tres libri Cronicarum Helinandi Monachi.

Primi	2o fo. peritos esse
Secundi	annis qui
Tercii	humane"

¹¹⁹ SAYLE, "King's Hall Library", p. 59: "Memorandum that on 3 July 13 Henry VI Ralph Cromwell treasurer of England took out of the King's treasury 2 books of Chronicles late the property of King Henry V, which were afterwards delivered to Richard Caudrey [Master of King's Hall *CHKn*] by the said Treasurer.

Liber Cronicarum Helinandi.

Memorandum that 15 July 13 Henry VI Ralph Lord Cromwell treasurer of England and Chamberlain of the Exchequer with the consent and assent of the Lords of the King's Council delivered to Richard Caudrey master of the King's Hall divers books of civil law and other books to be kept in the college during the King's pleasure."

Palgrave's edition, to which Sayle refers in his footnotes, gives a somewhat fuller version. I quote Palgrave's Latin text at issue and indicate the relevant words that were omitted in Sayle's paraphrase, here in boldface (*Antient Kalendars of the Treasury of the Exchequer*, ed. F. PALGRAVE, vol. II, London, 1836, pp. 154-155); in the margin one reads: "**cronycles**". Palgrave's main text runs as follows:

"5 Memorandum quod iii^o die Julii anno regni Regis Henrici sexti xiii^o. Radulphus Dominus de Cromwelle Thesaurarius Anglie cepit extra Thesaurum Regis duos libros cronicorum qui nuper fuerunt Domini Henrici nuper Regis Anglie quinti post conquestum **per manus**

Helinand's *Chronicon*, which is very likely, the Cottonian manuscript of Helinand must originate from around or before 1420, for Henry V reigned from 1412 to 1422. The source, however, of the insertion of the reference to Helinand's *Chronicon* between the two entries in Sayle's article, is open to further research.¹²⁰

In any case, a complete manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* was kept in King's Hall until the mid 1530s. John Leland made a research trip through England and Wales in his capacity as Royal Antiquarian by order of Henry VIII, and was especially interested in historical material that could support the Arthur claim of the young Tudor dynasty.¹²¹ The only manuscripts in the library of King's Hall that he considered worth mentioning, are Cassiodorus's *Variae* and Helinand's History "from the creation of the world to the age of the Emperors Henry and Otto," which consisted, according to Leland, of 44 books.¹²² Of course, the number 44 is of crucial impor-

Willelmi Constable [This William Constable's identity is not yet clear *CHKn*]. Postea liberantur Ricardo Caudrey per dictum Thesaurarium Anglie."

On p. 155, one reads in the margin: "(p. 79.)" and "Caudrey". Palgrave's main text runs as follows:

"6 Memorandum quod xv die Julii, anno regni regis Henrici sexti xiiiio Radulphus Dominus de Cromwulle Thesaurarius Anglie et Camerarius de Scaccario de consensu et assensu Dominorum de Consilio dicti Domini Regis deliberaverunt Ricardo Caudrey Magistro Collegii predicti Domini Regis in Universitate sua Cantabrigiensi diversos libros juris civilis et aliorum librorum custodiendos in eodem collegio quamdiu dicto Domino Regi placuerit, ut patet per indenturam de liberacione dictorum librorum factam inter dictos Thesaurarium et Camerarium et dictum Ricardum, que quidem indentura remanet in hanaperio de termino Pasche anno xiii^o predicto".

"Qui quidem libri uirtute brevis de privato sigillo eisdem Thesaurario et Camerario directi de dato secundo die Julii anno xviii^o liberantur eidem collegio, ibidem imperpetuum remansuri ut patet per idem breve de privato sigillo remanens (?) in hanaperio de termino Sancti Michaelis Anno xix dicti Regis."

¹²⁰ Perhaps an examination of the *King's Hall Accounts*, the collection of accounts, memoranda and reports of King's Hall from 1337 to 1544 (i.e. two years before the Hall was incorporated into the newly founded Trinity College) would provide further data. For these *Accounts*, see ch. 4 of COBBAN, "*The King's Hall*" (above, n. 116), pp. 112-47: "The King's Hall Accounts: Internal Economy".

¹²¹ For John LELAND's special concern for King Arthur and Arthurian England, see his *Assertatio inclytissimi Arturii regis Britanniae* published in 1544 in London, reprinted in *The Famous Historie of Chynon of England by Christopher Middleton to which is added The Assertion of King Arthure translated by Richard Robinson from Leland's Assertio Inclytissimi Arturii together with the Latin original*, ed. W.E. MEAD, London, 1925. For his travels as Royal Antiquarian, see Th. KENDRICK's Foreword to L. TOULMIN SMITH, *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1535-1543*, vol. I, London, 1964.

¹²² John LELAND, *De rebus britannicis collectanea* cum Thomae Hearnii Praefatione, Notis et Indice ad Editionem primam, Editio altera, Vol. IV, London, 1770 [Tomus III], p. 17:

"In biblioth: aulae Regiae
Liber variarum Cassiodori

tance. This number is not only printed in the second edition of Hearn's edition of Leland's *Collectanea*, but one also encounters it in Leland's autograph notes, preserved in the Bodleian Library.¹²³ If one takes into account Leland's remark that the History by Helinand continues up to the age the Emperors Henry and Otto, one must conclude that the King's Hall manuscript still contained the text of the present book 49, which is only preserved in the Tissier edition. In all probability, Leland read the information about these emperors in the headings of the last leaves in the manuscript.¹²⁴ These Emperors Henry and Otto must be Henry VI (d. 1197), and Otto IV, who was elected as Roman King by the Welf party and crowned Emperor by Innocent III in 1209. Thus it appears that the complete text of Helinand's *Chronicon* was to be found in Cambridge in England until around 1540. Does this imply that the two other parts of the Cambridge Helinand have disappeared for ever? Unfortunately this probably holds for the majority of the leaves. Nevertheless, Gaskell and Robson remark in their study of the history of the library of Trinity College that "many of the sixteenth-century account books are strengthened with leaves from medieval manuscripts, probably deriving from college libraries",¹²⁵ so it is possible that some scattered fragments may yet be discovered.

It is clear that the Cottonian manuscript was not written for the English King, but we do not know from where it originated. In the 1890s Thompson, the keeper of the manuscripts of the British Museum, suggested a French origin,¹²⁶ but considering the Canterbury material that was bound after the *Chronicon*, Mrs. Arnould-Cancel did not exclude Canter-

Historia Helinandi à creatione mundi ad tempora Henrici & Othonis imperatorum, complectens 44.libros."

¹²³ In MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gen. Top. c 3 [= vol. III van Leland's *Collectanea*] one reads, unmistakably in Leland's hand, on p. 14:

"In: bibliotheca aulae Regiae
Liber uariarum Cassiodori

Historia Helinandi a creatione mundi ad tempora Henrici, et othonis imperatorum, complectens 44. libros."

¹²⁴ Leland's '44' might be the result of misreading the Roman numeral 'xxxix'; the Cottonian MS uses 'ix' for the Roman numeral 9 instead of 'iiii', which easily could have been mistaken for 'iv', a number that was commonly rendered with the Roman numeral 'iiii' in the main text and headings of the Cottonian codex!

¹²⁵ Ph. GASKELL and R. ROBSON, *The Library of Trinity College, Cambridge: a Short History*, Cambridge, 1971, p. 5: "Many of the sixteenth-century Trinity College account books are strengthened with leaves from medieval manuscripts, probably deriving from college libraries."

¹²⁶ P. MEYER, "Les premiers livres de la Chronique d'Hélinand", *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, 46 (1885), pp. 198-200: dont [sc. Claudius B. IX *CHK*] la description suivante nous a été communiquée par M. Thompson, le savant et zélé conservateur du département des manuscrits: ... La copie a dû être faite en France au xv^e siècle."

bury as place of origin.¹²⁷ In 1983, Edmé Smits accepted her conclusion, albeit with some hesitation.¹²⁸ It is important, however, for the history of the manuscript to know that the other parts of the present codex Cotton, Claudius B. IX were added after the first part had entered Sir Robert Cotton's library. Perhaps, detailed codicological and palaeographical examination will shed new light in this darkness. On the other hand, there is consensus among recent researchers that, on palaeographical grounds, the beginning of the 15th century is an acceptable date for the origin of the Cottonian manuscript. This means that another, older manuscript containing the complete text of Helinand's *Chronicon* existed around 1400 in England or in France.

7. Concluding Remarks

After this rough ride through a barren landscape of names, dates, manuscripts, libraries, theft and minor mistakes, I offer some concluding remarks.

It seems very likely that Vincent of Beauvais and Aubri of Trois-Fontaines each had another manuscript of Helinand's *Chronicon* on his desk. Vincent speaks about a monumental volume, which contained the majority of the 49 books, whereas Aubri only disposed of books 45 to 49, the text that was found by Tissier in the 1660s at Froidmont.

As is to be expected, the authors of the bio-bibliographies repeat, until far into the seventeenth century, the bio-bibliographical data that came from Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, compiled one generation after Helinand, which generally appears to be well-informed. They do not add anything new, and indiscriminately copy the mistakes made by their predecessors more than once, unless they are confronted with manifest errors, such as as Lycosthenes and Simler's placing of Helinand's acme in 1069. For all their shortcomings, these writers deserve credit for the fact that Helinand's name did not pass into complete oblivion.

Attention to Helinand's approach to writing history was utterly meagre in the Parisian circles of the historically interested intelligentsia from the second part of the 16th century. Antoine L'Oisel, who was very interested in Helinand as a vernacular poet, said nothing about the contents of

¹²⁷ ARNAULD-CANCEL, "Le huitième livre" (above, n. 3), p. 11: "Thompson pense qu'il s'agit d'une copie faite à la fin du XVe siècle en France. [In fact Thompson was not speaking about the *end* of the fifteenth century *CHKn*] Cependant, puisque la chronique est associée dans le manuscrit à des listes de saints et de martyrs de Cantorbéry, on peut avancer l'hypothèse que la copie est originaire de cette dernière ville."

¹²⁸ SMITS, "Helinand of Froidmont and the A-Text" (above, n. 2), p. 334: "It may have come from Canterbury."

Helinand's *Chronicon*. Claude Fauchet and his historian colleagues showed no interest in the Helinand fragment that was preserved in the beautiful Beaupré manuscript in the collection of de Saint-André, but were very enthusiastic about his *Vers de la mort*. Obviously, the Beaupré manuscript was a collector's item for bibliophiles.

As a result of the *ressourcement* movement within the Cistercian Order during the seventeenth century, one looked at Helinand from a different point of view, viz. as a member of the Cistercian Order. This approach resulted in Tissier's edition of the Helinand material that was kept at Froidmont Abbey – the monks knew it was there and had kept it in an unbound state till 1680 –, but neither the five edited books of the *Chronicon* nor his sermons attracted much attention yet.

Outside the Cistercian Order, the local historians did not show serious interest in the Froidmont manuscript and its contents, which unlike the Beaupré and Cottonian manuscripts actually was a working manuscript. Thus one will look in vain for references to Helinand's *Chronicon* in Pierre Louvet's *L'Histoire de la ville et cité de Beauvais, et des antiquitez de Beauvaisis* (Rouen 1614), and L'Oisel, who visited Froidmont, did not mention nor use the Froidmont manuscript. Although Delisle explicitly states that Tissier's edition shows serious shortcomings, the national or international scholarly world did not pay attention to the Froidmont manuscript, until Ferdinand Lot wrote his letter of inquiry to no effect in 1920.

The investigation into the history of the Cottonian manuscript shows that the complete text of Helinand's *Chronicon* was still available until far in the early modern period, but it was hidden in an English centre of learning. This led to the paradox that a very large text that had lost the interest of the scholarly world, but about which every scholar thought that substantial parts of it were lost for ever, was transcribed in three large volumes, in a manner that was very costly for its time, and ended up in the library of a university college where it was seldom consulted, in all probability because the college specialized in legal studies. Surely this was a case of the wrong manuscript in the wrong place at the wrong time!

Not until 1918 did Paul Lehmann, one of the founders of the modern study of the literature of the Latin Middle Ages, usher in a new appreciation for Helinand and his historiographical work and claim serious attention for Helinand's *Chronicon* on behalf of the students of the Latin Culture of the Middle Ages. Unfortunately, his legitimate calls for attention for the three manuscripts of Helinand's *Chronicon* remained without effect for several more decades.¹²⁹

¹²⁹ Thanks are due to Dr. Robert Olsen, Groningen, for help with the translation of the final version of this essay.

Summary

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, the Cistercian monk Helinand of Froidmont composed a comprehensive universal history, which was intensively used by Vincent of Beauvais while compiling his *Speculum Historiale* and *Speculum Doctrinale*. To date, only the fragments of Helinand's chronicle contained in two manuscripts and one seventeenth-century printing are available to us.

This begins by presenting a synthetic and chronological analysis of the late medieval and early modern scholarship on Helinand's chronicle, exploring the motives behind the interest in the author and his universal history. This work was largely based on the data found in Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*. While French historians of the mid-sixteenth century were mainly interested in Helinand's vernacular poem *Vers de la mort*, the sixteenth-century Cistercian *ressourcement* movement prompted the Cistercian monks Karel De Visch and Bertrand Tissier to pay serious attention to Helinand's Latin *œuvre*. This resulted in an edition of the books 45-49 of Helinand's chronicle, as well as a collection of his sermons and some minor Latin works by Tissier in 1669. The movement failed, however, to establish Helinand's reputation as a renowned historian outside the restricted domain of the Cistercian order, for it was not until the second decade of the twentieth century that Paul Lehmann convincingly argued Helinand's merits in the field of medieval historiography.

The second part of the essay examines the history of the three manuscripts that preserve the fragments of Helinand's chronicle, viz. the present Mss *Vat. Reg. 535* (a former Beaupré Ms), and *London, BL, Cotton., Claudius B IX* (a former Cambridge, King's Hall Ms that, through the library of John Dee, happened to arrive in Lord Cotton's collection), and the lost Froidmont Ms used by Tissier for his 1669 edition.

Helinand's *De Bono Regimine Principis*: A Mirror for Princes or an Exegesis of Deuteronomy 17, 14-20?*

Meindert GEERTSMA

(Groningen)

1. Introduction

Modern scholarship on the French court under Philip Augustus (1180-1223) and the tradition of mirrors for princes in the Middle Ages attributes the authorship of a treatise now entitled *De bono regimine principis* (henceforth DBRP)¹ to the Cistercian monk Helinand of Froidmont (* ca. 1160 – † after 1229). It is usually described as a moral and didactic work in the ‘mirror-for-princes’ genre, and is assumed to have been written by order of Philip Augustus himself or, at least, intended by its author for use at the French court. Accordingly, Helinand is supposed to have made a substantial contribution to the development of this genre on the European continent. When subsequently compiling his *Chronicon*, he is thought to have inserted this ‘mirror’ as chapter 38 in the eleventh book of this work, incorporating it in his commentary on the Book of Deuteronomy.

It is however questionable if *De bono regimine principis* was conceived as a separate treatise commissioned by the French court or anyone connected to the court, and only afterwards included by Helinand in his *Chronicon*. Below, I will argue that the work originally belonged to Helinand’s histori-

* I would like here to acknowledge the members of the Groningen Helinand Research Team for their constant support and scholarly camaradery. Onno Kneepkens encouraged me to write this essay, and I benefited from his helpful advice and comments. I am also grateful to the other members of the research team (listed in order of team seniority: Edmé Smits †, Hans Voorbij, Rinus Woesthuis, Eric Saak and Bea Blokhuis) for openly and generously sharing their knowledge and views on Helinand over many years.

¹ This treatise was variously named or known by a variety of names in the later Middle Ages and Early Modern era. In this article, I use the title *De bono regimine principis*, which first occurs in Bertrand TISSIER, *Bibliotheca Patrum Cisterciensium*, vol. 7, Paris, 1669, p. 324b. This title is also adopted in the Migne edition of Helinand’s works (PL 212, cols. 721-722 and 735-736), and is now commonly used in secondary literature.

cal exegesis on the Book of Deuteronomy, the principal part of Book 11 of his *Chronicon*, and only subsequently excerpted by Vincent of Beauvais for use as an important element in the *Flores Helinandi* of his *Speculum Historiale*. To support my position, I will first discuss recent views on Helinand and the origin of DBRP held by four prominent historians. I will then examine the two lines of DBRP transmission in the Middle Ages, i.e. (a) Helinand's *Chronicon* and (b) Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale* and *Speculum Doctrinale*, the latter of which contains extracts from *Chronicon* 11, 38. This examination will also consider the ways in which DBRP is characterised in these two traditions. It will be followed by a discussion of the sources on which the four above-mentioned modern historians base their claims about Helinand and his DBRP. A discussion of Chapter 38 in the eleventh book of the *Chronicon* will then ensue, along with a comparison of this text with Vincent of Beauvais' version. The conclusion will synthesise and consolidate the above-listed research into a recapitulation of the argued position.

2. Recent Views on the Origin of Helinand's *De bono regimine principis*

In his monumental work on the government of Philip Augustus, John W. Baldwin draws attention to the fact that DBRP contains excerpts from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* in its exegesis of Deuteronomy 17, 14-20. He assumes that Helinand wrote DBRP during the lifetime of Philip Augustus either for the king himself or for the king's son. According to Baldwin, the surviving fragments of this work derive from a mid-thirteenth century collection of excerpts made by Vincent of Beauvais for his *Speculum Historiale*.²

In his article on mirrors for princes in the *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, Hans H. Anton deals with DBRP in a similar vein as Baldwin. He argues that this text was written around 1200 by order of Philip Augustus, and claims that this treatise, given the royal commission for its composition, represents an incorporation of the 'mirror' genre in the emergence of the first 'Nationalstaat', i.e. France.³

² J. W. BALDWIN, *The Government of Philip Augustus*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, 1986, p. 571: 'Finally, Hélinand was responsible for the *De Bono Regimine principis*, a didactic mirror-of-princes text that loosely excerpted passages from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* to explicate Deuteronomy 17: 14-20 on the good king. Since it was undoubtedly written while Philip was alive, it was most probably intended for the Capetian monarch or for his son. It survives only in those excerpts collected by Vincent de Beauvais, *Speculum historiale* 1227-30, reprinted in *PL* 212: 735-46.'

³ H. H. ANTON, "Fürstenspiegel", in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, IV, München-Zürich, 1989, col. 1045: 'Um 1200 gab Helinand von Froidmont in seinem Fürstenspiegel «De regimine

In 1993, French historian Jacques Krynen dated the creation of this text as a separate treatise to around 1210 and argued that it was later inserted by its author in the *Chronicon*. A question mark indicates, however, that he had some doubt about whether the work was written by order of Philip Augustus.⁴ In 1999, he displayed more confidence about the royal involvement, stating that DBRP was most likely written for or maybe even by order of the French court, if not the king himself.⁵

In 2009, Péter Molnár struck a slightly different note. Although his line of reasoning is not always clear, he states: 'En faisant de nombreuses digressions, Hélinand insère dans son *Chronicon* de commentaires abondants et plusieurs traités autonomes. Notre texte figure parmi ces derniers; il se présente comme l'exégèse des fameux versets de Deutéronome (17, 14-20)'. This observation certainly creates the impression that he follows Baldwin and Krynen in holding that DBRP was conceived and written as a separate treatise, and was later inserted by Helinand into his *Chronicon*.⁶ On the other hand, he disputes Krynen's suggestion that DBRP was likely written for Philip Augustus' court because, in his view, historical evidence for this claim is completely lacking.⁷ Instead, he puts forward another possible patron: Guérin, chancellor and highly esteemed counsellor of Philip Augustus, who was named Bishop of Senlis in 1213.⁸ To support this view, Molnár refers to the phrase from Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Histori-*

principum» im Auftrag Philipps II August die neuen Lehren des Johannes (sc. of Salisbury, *MG*) weiter. Die Fürstenspiegel traten damit in Verbindung mit dem ersten «Nationalstaat», mit Frankreich.'

⁴ J. KRYNEN, *L'empire du roi*, Paris, 1993, p. 170: 'Vers 1210, à la demande de Philippe Auguste (?), le moine cistercien Hélinand de Froidmont compose un traité intitulé *De bono regimine principis*'; and *id.*, *L'empire*, p. 478, n. 19: 'Hélinand a inclus ce traité dans sa *Chronique* (livre XI, chap. 38)'.

⁵ J. KRYNEN, "Du bon usage des 'Leges'. Le droit savant dans le *De bono regimine principis* d'Hélinand de Froidmont (1210)", in *Specula principum* – ed. A. DE BENEDICTIS – A. PISAPIA, Frankfurt a. M., 1999, p. 160: 'Très probablement conçu pour l'édification morale et politique de Philippe Auguste ou (et) de son fils, peut-être même une commande officielle'.

⁶ P. MOLNÁR, "De la morale à la science politique. La transformation du miroir des princes au milieu du XIII^e siècle", in *L'éducation au gouvernement et à la vie. La tradition des 'regles de vie' de l'Antiquité au Moyen Âge. Actes du colloque international, Pise, 18 et 19 mars 2005* – ed. P. ODORICO, Paris, 2009 (École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales), pp. 181-204, esp. p. 186.

⁷ MOLNÁR, p.186, n. 16: 'Si on ne peut pas exclure cette éventualité, on doit remarquer également qu'on ne dispose d'aucune preuve dans ce sens'.

⁸ MOLNÁR, p. 186, n. 16: 'En tout cas, si on en croit le témoignage de Vincent de Beauvais, Hélinand de Froidmont aurait été apparenté au très influent frère Guérin, ancien conseiller spécial de Philippe Auguste. C'est plutôt ce personnage qui aurait pu être le destinataire de ce texte.' For Guérin, the bishop of Senlis, and his career as civil servant and counsellor at the French court, see BALDWIN, 1986, pp. 115-125.

ale 29,108, in which the learned Dominican informs his readership that Helinand lent some quires of his chronicle to ‘cuidam familiari suo, scilicet bonae memoriae domino Garino Siluanectensi episcopo,’⁹ without ever having them returned. Molnar’s use of the term ‘*apparenté*’ is prompted by Vincent’s use of the word ‘*familiaris*’, and suggests that he regarded Helinand and Guérin as relatives, although no unequivocal evidence is available to support this view. It seems more likely that, in this context, ‘*familiaris*’ simply means that both men were close acquaintances or even friends, rather than indicating that they were close relatives or next of kin.

3. *The Transmission of DBRP in the Middle Ages*

As argued above the DBRP was handed down in the Middle Ages through two lines of transmission: the *Chronicon* of Helinand and the *Flores Helinandi* by Vincent of Beauvais.

a. *The Chronicon*

In the two surviving manuscripts of Helinand’s *Chronicon*, the eleventh book contains a large chapter 38 entitled ‘Lex de rege constituendo’. It is presented as an exegesis of Deuteronomy 17, 14-20 and consists almost entirely of fragments derived from John of Salisbury’s *Policraticus*. The text is preserved, in its entirety, on pages 282a-294a of the Vatican manuscript of Helinand’s *Chronicon* (Vatican, BAV, Reg. lat. 535), which contains the second and later version.¹⁰ The London manuscript (London, B.L., Cotton. Claudius B IX) contains a truncated text of this section on ff. 183ra-185vb from an earlier version of the *Chronicon*, although this manuscript was not copied earlier than the end of the fourteenth century.¹¹ The text of the London MS breaks off at the words *Alioquin presentem (epistolam testem inuoco)*¹², as two quires, containing the second half of Book 11 and the first 8 chapters of Book 12, have disappeared. However, comparing a part of

⁹ VINCENT, *Speculum Historiale*, 29,108, ed. Douai, 1624, col.1222a. For this edition of Vincent’s *Speculum*, I used the reprint of Graz, 1965.

¹⁰ For the two versions of the *Chronicon* by Helinand, see J.B. VOORBIJ – M.M. WOESTHUIS, “Editing the ‘Chronicon’ of Helinand of Froidmont: the use of the textual witnesses”, in *Media Latinitas. A collection of essays to mark the occasion of the retirement of L.J. Engels* – ed. R.I.A. NIP – H. VAN DIJK – E.M.C. VAN HOUTS – C.H. KNEEPKENS – G.A.A. KORTEKAAS, Steenbrugge-Turnhout, 1996, pp. 345-354, esp. p. 346.

¹¹ For the history of these two manuscripts, see C.H. KNEEPKENS, “The Odyssey of the Manuscripts of Helinand’s *Chronicon*”, *Sacris Erudiri*, 52 (2013), pp. 353-384.

¹² The words between brackets are not in the main text but constitute the catchword written down in the lower margin of f. 185vb, indicating the first words of the following quire that is missing.

the section preserved in the London MS with the text of the Vatican MS suggests that the two manuscripts show no appreciable variant readings or other discrepancies.

Of paramount importance to the present research is the fact that, in Helinand's text of *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38 provides no indication that DBRP initially existed as a separate treatise subsequently incorporated in the *Chronicon*. In other cases involving insertion of material that Helinand previously composed, he explicitly informs his readership about the inclusion of the pre-existing work. An example of this practice is found in Book 6, ch. 65, where a letter from Philip, Abbot 'de Valle', is cited and in the ensuing chapter (6,66), where Helinand includes his answer to this letter. This exchange of letters is introduced at the close of Book 6, ch. 64 with the following words:

Auctor De hac senectute Ysaac memini me scripsisse epistolam quandam ad Philippum quondam abbatem de Valle quam in hoc loco inserere placet cum ipsa Philippi epistola cui illa respondet, propter quedam dubitabilia que in expositione martyris Ypoliti continentur.¹³

Another example occurs in Book 8, ch. 8, where Helinand quotes from a sermon. He introduces this citation with an explicit reference to his own authorship of the quoted text:

De hoc enim oraculo sermonem quendam in conuentu fratrum edidisse me memini. Eundem uero in hoc loco inserere mihi quidem non pigrum et presenti negotio explicando scio pernecessarium. Sicut autem se habet.¹⁴

At the end of this citation from his sermon, Helinand once again indicates his re-use of previously written material:

Hec de illo sermone nostro excerpta sufficient ad probandum quod Apollinis oraculum male a Macrobio et a quibusdam philosophis sit intellectum. De hoc eodem oraculo epistolam quandam olim ad Drogonem Nouiomensem canonicum scripsisse me memini, cuius partem in hoc loco inserere curauim.¹⁵

Book 8, ch. 9 does, in fact, contain the mentioned extract from the letter to Drogo as well.

These examples demonstrate how Helinand uses such self-reference markers as *edidisse me memini*, *memini me scripsisse* or *inserere* to acknowl-

¹³ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, Vatican MS, p. 107a.

¹⁴ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, Vatican MS, p. 155a; VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p. 1222b, summarises Helinand's text like this: 'de oraculo Apollinis [...] sermonem in conuentu fratrum edidisse me memini in hunc modum.'

¹⁵ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, Vatican MS, p. 160a; Cfr VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.* 29,112-113, ed. Douai, p. 1224a.

edge the reproduction of previously written texts. No such acknowledgment occurs in *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38. This absence of self-reference does not, of course, disprove the pre-existence of the DBRP but certainly reiterates the fact that there is no direct evidence to assume such pre-existence. Molnár correctly points out that Helinand liberally inserted large parts of commentaries and several separate treatises in his *Chronicon*¹⁶, but it should be noted that he added a self-reference marker when he was quoting from his *own* works. Molnár's subsequent assertion that 'notre texte figure parmi ces derniers' (i.e. separate treatises, *MG*) may have been induced by the typography and layout of the edition of Vincent's *Flores Helinandi* in the *Patrologia Latina* or by the statement by Gillette Tyl-Labory that: 'Il fait de longues digressions [...], insère certaines de ses œuvres antérieures, une lettre à Philippe, abbé du Val-Sainte-Marie, ou encore ses traités, le *De cognitione sui* au livre 8, et le *De bono regimine principis* au livre 11.'¹⁷ Direct proof of origination in Helinand's earlier writings may, however, only be provided for the sections of Book 6 and 8 mentioned above.

b. *The Flores Helinandi*

A few decades after the death of Helinand, Vincent of Beauvais included a text corresponding to about half of Book 11, ch. 38 of Helinand's *Chronicon* in his *Speculum Historiale*. He classified this text, along with two other rather comprehensive extracts from Helinand's work, as *Flores Helinandi*. In the nineteenth century, these *Flores Helinandi* were reproduced verbatim by Migne in volume 212 of the series *Patrologia Latina*.¹⁸ The three component parts were each given an individual title; the part taken from *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38 being entitled *De bono regimine principis*.¹⁹

Vincent of Beauvais introduces Helinand and his works in book 29, ch. 108 of his *Speculum Historiale*. Vincent's remarks on the several parts and titles of Helinand's works are very concise, and his account of the way in which he incorporates excerpts from Helinand's *oeuvre* is far from complete. He mentions Helinand's '*chronica*', from which he cites throughout the *Speculum Historiale* in a manner that follows the historical timeline.

¹⁶ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6] p. 186: 'En faisant de nombreuses digressions, Hélinand insère dans son *Chronicon* de commentaires abondants et plusieurs traités autonomes'.

¹⁷ G. TYL-LABORY, "Hélinand de Froidmont", in *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises. Le Moyen Âge* – ed. R. BOSSUAT – L. PICHARD – G. RAYNAUD DE LAGE, édition entièrement revue et mise à jour par G. HASENOHR – M. ZINK, Paris, 1992, p. 667.

¹⁸ *PL*, 212, cols. 721-760.

¹⁹ *PL*, 212, cols. 735-746. The editors of the *Patrologia Latina* borrowed this title from Tissier (see above, n. 1), from whom they also took over the text of the introductory *Monitum* (cols. 721-722).

However, some key issues discussed by Helinand in the *Chronicon* or elsewhere for which Vincent could not find a convenient place in his *Speculum* are presented separately as *Flores Helinandi* in the chapters 108-148 of book 29.²⁰ The excerpts from the *Chronicon* and other works by Helinand collected in these chapters are later entitled *De cognitione sui* (excerpts from *Chronicon*, Book 8, ch. 8-15), *De bono regimine principis* (excerpts from *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38) and *Liber de reparatione lapsi* (a separate letter not preserved in the *Chronicon* as far as we know). An important question is, however, whether Vincent already thought that these items were composed as separate works by Helinand. Evidently, Vincent did not consider *De cognitione* to be an autonomous work, for he mentions its derivation from Book 8 of the *Chronicon*.²¹ On the other hand, Vincent may have regarded *De reparatione lapsi* as a self-contained treatise conceived in epistolary form, for it is the only work by Helinand that he explicitly mentions by title, aside from the *Vers de la mort*, the *Chronicon* and *Sermones*.²² In the case of the third treatise, *De bono regimine principis*, Vincent does not make any allusion in the *Speculum Historiale* to the *Chronicon* as its source, and he does not classify this work as belonging to the 'other writings' of Helinand either. Instead, he offers it to his readers under the same title found in Helinand's *Chronicon*: '*De constituendo rege*',²³ but in altered form. In contrast to the undivided text in Helinand's work, Vincent divides the text of DBRP into thirteen chapters, providing each with a specific title that has no counterpart in the manuscripts of the *Chronicon*. However, a strong indication can be found elsewhere in Vincent's work that the source from which he took the text of DBRP was the *Chronicon* and not one of the separate treatises qualified by Vincent as '*quaedam alia eius scripta*'.²⁴ *Speculum Historiale*, Book 3, ch. 91 contains a passage on Demosthenes that Vincent extracted from Helinand's *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38. In the *Speculum Historiale*, this excerpt is preceded by the reference tag

²⁰ VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p. 1222ab: 'Hic autem etiam quādam eiusdem operis notabilia, quā nusquam sunt superius posita inserere volui, et etiam de quibusdam alijs eius scriptis, vnde flores excerpsi. [...] Hāc sunt autem quā de prāfatis eius opusculis excerpsi, et in vnum hic apposui.'

²¹ VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p. 1222b: '*Helinandus in chronicis lib. 8. Errores Philosophorum* [...]'

²² VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p. 1222ab: '[...] qui et illos versus de morte in vulgari nostro [...] composuit [...] et etiam chronicam diligenter ab initio mundi vsque ad tempus suum in maximo quodam volumine digessit [...] Scripsit enim, vt legitur, epistolam, cuius titulus est *De reparatione lapsi* [...] Scripsit etiam idem Helinandus sermones aliquos peroptimos [...]'

²³ In full: '*De constituendo rege et primo de moribus eius*'. See: VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,121, ed. Douai, p. 1227a.

²⁴ Cfr above n. 20.

'*Helinandus lib. 11*'. Moreover, Vincent's *Speculum Doctrinale* also contains several excerpts from the same chapter of the *Chronicon*, many of which are explicitly said to originate in *Chronicon*, Book 11²⁵ and many of which also appear in DBRP. In the *Speculum Doctrinale*, Vincent supplies ample information on the sources of this cited text, which he clearly attributes to *Helinandus lib. 11* or *Helinandus in Chronicis* or *Helinandus in Chron. 11. lib.* or *Helinandus in chron. suis lib. 11* and often *Helinandus ubi supra* as well.²⁶ Since several of Vincent's quotations from Book 11 of Helinand's *Chronicon* in the *Speculum Doctrinale* also occur in the *Speculum Historiale*, it would seem logical to assume that Vincent derived the passages in the *Speculum Historiale* from this same Book 11. Accordingly, we may safely conclude that the parts from DBRP that do not appear in the *Speculum Doctrinale* were known to him solely by way of the *Chronicon*. It is noteworthy to mention that Helinand, when discussing the subject of the just and unjust king in Book 13, ch. 9, concludes this section by referring to observations on this topic that he had earlier stated in the *Chronicon*:

Auctor De iusticia uero regis superius in libro xi^o capitulo xxx^oviii^o latius disseruimus cum quedam utilia de Deuteronomio excerperemus.²⁷

It would seem that, whenever Helinand incorporates a cross-reference in the *Chronicon* that refers to a passage occurring in the DBRP, he makes no mention of any mirror of princes but prefers to cite the relevant book and chapter of the *Chronicon*.

The first time that DBRP is explicitly mentioned as a separate treatise and given its specific title occurs, as far as we know, in the chronicle written by the late thirteenth-century historian, Guillaume de Nangis. The entry in this chronicle for 1210 includes a note on Helinand that echoes Vincent's words on Helinand in *Speculum Historiale*, Book 29, ch. 108:

His temporibus clarebat in territorio belvacensi Helinandus Frigidi-montis monachus, qui *Chronicam* ab initio mundi usque ad tempus suum diligenter composuit, et librum *de Regimine principum*, et alium *qui planctus monachi lapsi* dicitur, compilavit.²⁸

²⁵ The majority of these excerpts are found in Bkk. 7 and 8 of the *Speculum Doctrinale*, but the Bkk 4 and 5 also contain some excerpts from Helinand's *Chronicon*, 11, 38.

²⁶ The reference in the Douai 1624 edition of *Speculum Doctrinale*, 7,106 to *Helinandus 9 libr.* is due to a reading error, viz. the erroneous change of the Roman numbers IX and XI, as appears from the incunabula of the *Speculum Doctrinale*, Strasbourg, ca 1477, GW M50560.

²⁷ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 13,9, Vatican MS, p. 367a.

²⁸ Guillelmus de Nangis, *Chronicon* – ed. P.C.F. DAUNOU – J. NAUDET, Paris, 1840 (*Recueil des Historiens des Gaules et de la France*, vol. 20), p. 755A ; Vincent's words in *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108: 'His temporibus in territorio Beluacensi fuit Helinandus monachus Frigidimontis [...] qui [...] chronicam diligenter ab initio mundi vsque ad tempus suum [...] digessit.'

The phrasing is reminiscent of the statement by Vincent of Beauvais and suggests that Guillaume did not likely have any access to the DBRP aside from Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*. Consideration must, however, be given to the fact that Vincent's *Flores Helinandi* began, over time, to have a separate existence detached from the *Speculum Historiale*. However, the nature of this separate existence still remains to be investigated. The works of the late medieval bio-bibliographers, who rely entirely on Vincent's *Speculum Historiale* for information on Helinand, fail to cite either DBRP or the *Flores* to Helinand, although they explicitly refer to his *De reparatione lapsi*.²⁹

In summary, it can be safely argued that thirteenth-century texts do not provide any serious evidence to indicate that Helinand first wrote a treatise entitled DBRP, which was preserved in Vincent's *Speculum* and of which an expanded version was subsequently inserted into Helinand's *Chronicon*.

4. *Sources Underlying the View that DBRP was Originally a Separate Treatise Commissioned by Philip Augustus*

The lack of early thirteenth-century evidence for Helinand's authorship of a mirror for princes raises question about the grounds on which Baldwin, Anton, and Krynen affirm that Philip Augustus commissioned the 'treatise' *De bono regimine principis*. All three scholars take this fact for granted without providing any argumentation whatsoever. Moreover, Molnár's more cautiously-stated view that Guérin, bishop of Senlis and close acquaintance of the French court, may have commissioned this work, remains equally speculative. All four historians assume without question that DBRP was originally written as a separate, self-contained treatise and was only later incorporated in the *Chronicon*, while failing to cite any medieval source that may provide evidence supporting this assumption.³⁰

It is obvious that the two suppositions by the historians mentioned in the preceding paragraph are closely related. If DBRP was conceived as a

²⁹ Cfr Johannes TRITHEMIUS, *De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis* – ed. P. QUENTEL, Köln, 1546, p. 173: 'Scripsit enim plura opuscula, quibus nomen suum immortalitati donauit. E quibus feruntur subiecta: Ab exordio mundi vsque ad suam aetatem, magnum & insigne volumen

Historiarum	li. 48
De reparatione lapsi	li. 1. G. lamentationes & ve
Sermones plures	li. 1.
Epistolarum ad diuersos	li. 1.
Et alia plura.	

³⁰ Molnár refers to Guillaume de Nangis' mentioning DBRP as a separate treatise but overlooks the fact that, for information about Helinand and his works, De Nangis was entirely dependent on Vincent of Beauvais.

separate, self-contained treatise, Helinand's alleged contacts with the royal court would suggest its likely commission by the French court or even its possible dedication to the French king or crown prince. However, the four modern authors mentioned above all base their views directly or indirectly on the 1938 work *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters* by Wilhelm Berges.³¹ Baldwin refers explicitly to Berges, Krynen mentions both Baldwin and Berges, and Anton includes the work of Berges in his bibliography, while displaying a remarkable similarity in wording to Berges' text.³² Molnár, the most recent of these authors, was familiar with Berges' fundamental study on medieval mirrors for princes and Krynen's *L'empire*.³³ It is, in fact, in Berges' work that the view of DBRP as an autonomous work commissioned by the French court is to be found.³⁴ When describing the mirror-for-princes genre, Berges dedicates a section to *De bono regimine principis* and heads it as follows:

5. Helinand von Froidmont, O. Cist.:

De regimine principum (o. ä.), ca. 1200 im Auftrage Philipps II. August von Frankreich.

There is, however, very little support for Berges's claim that Philip Augustus asked Helinand to compose a treatise on his rule that might be qualified as a mirror for princes. He does not provide any medieval source, or even any discussion on this issue. For biographical data on Helinand, he refers to Vincent of Beauvais (*Speculum Historiale* 29,108) and Oudin's *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiae*.³⁵ In fact, it is only in the latter work that there is any suggestion of a commission by the French king, as the entry on Helinand in Oudin's *De scriptoribus* contains the following remark:

Carissimus itaque Philippo Augusto, scripsit etiam illo instante Tractatum seu librum *De regimine Regum*, MS. in nonnullis Bibliothecis Belgicis, ut refert Carolus Vischius.³⁶

³¹ W. BERGES, *Die Fürstenspiegel des hohen und späten Mittelalters*, Leipzig, 1938 (reprint Stuttgart, 1952), pp. 295-296.

³² BALDWIN, *The Government*, [above, n.1], p. 571, n. 28; KRYNEN, *L'empire* [above, n. 4], pp. 478-479, n. 8 and 19.

³³ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6], p. 181, n. 3; p. 186, n. 16.

³⁴ Berges noted, however, that Vincent of Beauvais did not refer to DBRP as a separate, self-contained treatise. He says (p. 296) that 'uns das Schweigen des Vinzenz über einen besonderen Fürstenspiegel des Helinands neuerlich auffält.'

³⁵ CASIMIR OUDIN, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiae Antiquis ...*, vol. III, Leipzig 1722, cols. 19-23.

³⁶ Oudin's communications on Helinand in his *Commentarius* are almost entirely adopted by Migne under the title of 'Notitia Historico-Litteraria' in *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 212 (cols. 477-82) as an introduction to the edition of Helinand's *oeuvre*. Perhaps, Berges read Oudin's

Acting in blind faith and, evidently, without checking, Berges apparently reproduced Oudin's words 'illo instante'. Accordingly, Helinand is supposed to have written his 'treatise' at the insistence of, or commissioned by King Philip Augustus. Moreover, Oudin emphasises the friendship between the king and Helinand.³⁷

It is, however, difficult to determine where Oudin may have obtained this information. It was certainly not from Carolus De Visch, whom he mentions as his authority. De Visch only states that a manuscript of *De regimine Principis* was kept 'in coenobio Canoniorum Regularium', the abbey of the Augustine Canons in Tongeren, Belgium.³⁸ However, the sentence in Oudin's text preceding the one cited above states:

Suavissime cantabat Helinandus, unde eum Rex Galliarum sapius mensæ suæ accumbere iubebat, uti discimus ex quibusdam Versibus Gallicis, quos refert seculum IV, *Vniversitatis Parisiensis* pag.746, in Catalogo illustrium Academicorum.

The words *Vniversitatis Parisiensis* are used by Oudin to refer to the work entitled *Historia Vniversitatis Parisiensis* by César-Egasse du Boulay. The latter author provides us with information on Helinand's life and writings, and concludes this section with a remark about Philip Augustus' amicable feelings for Helinand:

Tam suauiter autem canebat, vt eum Rex sæpe suæ mensæ accumbere iuberet: vti discimus ex his versibus rythmicis.

Quant ly Roy ot mangié s'appella Helinand

Pour ly esbanoyer, commanda que il chant.

Cil commence à noter ainsi con ly layant

Monter voldrent au Ciel comme gent mescreant.

Entre les Diex y ot vne bataille grant

Si ne fust Iuppiter à sa foudre bruyant

Qui tous les descocha, ia ne eussent garent.

Acceptissimus fuit Philippo Augusto.³⁹

remark in the *Notitia*, but he must have inspected a copy of Oudin's original, for he explicitly refers to col. 23 of the *Commentarius*, a reference that is lacking in Migne's *Notitia*.

³⁷ Mrs Prof. M.-G. Grossel discusses the story about Helinand and his close connection with the court of Philip Augustus at length in M.-G. GROSSEL, "Hélinand avant Froidmont: à la recherche d'un « trouvère » perdu", *Sacris Erudiri*, 52 (2013), pp. 319-352.

³⁸ Carolus DE VISCH, *Bibliotheca scriptorum sacri ordinis Cisterciensis*, Douai, 1649, p. 28: 'Scripsit tamen etiam Helinandus, librum De laude vitæ claustralis. Item alium, De regimine Principum. Qui duo libri reperiuntur M.S. in coenobio Canoniorum Regularium, Tungris.' De Visch repeats this information verbatim in the second edition of his *Bibliotheca*, Köln, 1656, on p. 140.

³⁹ Caesar Egassius BVLAEVs, *Historia Vniversitatis Parisiensis*, vol. 2, Paris, 1665, p. 746.

The similarity between the texts of Oudin and Du Boulay is striking. The only possible explanation is that, after borrowing Du Boulay's text about the relationship between Philip Augustus and Helinand as an artist, Oudin made a few minor changes in the text and came up with the theory that Helinand was commissioned by Philip Augustus ('illo instante') to write a treatise on his reign, *De regimine Regum*. The existence of the commission was likely based on speculation by Oudin, although he may have derived some support for this view from De Visch's statement about the existence of a manuscript of *De regimine Regum* in a Belgian library.⁴⁰

Consequently, it appears that Oudin is responsible for propagating the view of the DBRP's separate existence as an autonomous treatise commissioned by the French court. Du Boulay is far more restrained in his claims. The lines *Quant ly Roy ot mangié*, etc., cited by him, comprise ll. 6017-6023 of branche III of *Le Roman d'Alexandre* in the version of Alexandre de Paris. These seven lines were also cited by Antoine Loisel in his preface to his edition of Helinand's *Vers de la Mort* to indicate that, before entering monastic life, Helinand must have been a famous *trouvère*, performing at 'les cours des Princes, et maisons des grandes'.⁴¹ The belief that Helinand maintained a good relationship with the French court largely derives from Loisel's romantic sketch of Helinand's life, which is in turn based on the assumption that the literary person of the singer-performer Helinand in *Le Roman d'Alexandre* is the same as the Cistercian monk Helinand of Froidmont.⁴²

Similarly, no medieval or even early modern source can be provided to support Molnár's suggestion that Helinand wrote the work at the instigation of Guérin, a trusted confidant of the French king. The only indication of any connection between Helinand and Guérin of Senlis is the previ-

⁴⁰ Oudin probably failed to notice De Visch's statement in his *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Sacri Ordinis Cisterciensis* indicating that the manuscript kept in Tongeren contained two treatises written by Helinand, sc. *De regimine principum* and *De laude vitae claustralis*, which is a less common title of Helinand's *De reparatione lapsi*. As already mentioned above [p. 391], both texts are part of Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*. There is no reason to believe that the Tongeren MS contained a *De regimine* treatise that did not stem from Vincent's *Flores*. Incidentally, it is completely unlikely that De Visch personally inspected the manuscript in question. He was undoubtedly acquainted with its existence and contents through Antonius SANDERVS, *Bibliotheca Belgica Manuscripta*, 2 vols., Lille, 1641 – 1644. On p. 192 of vol. 2, Sanderus mentions that, in 1638, the library of the Regular Canons in Tongeren kept a codex containing 'Helinandus de laude vitę Claustralis, & Regimine Principum'. The Tongeren monastery of the Regular Canons was suppressed in 1794, the buildings sold in 1798, and the books and manuscripts suffered a similar fate shortly after that date.

⁴¹ Antoine LOISEL, *Vers de la Mort*, s.l.e.a. (1594!), f. 2verso; reprinted in: A. L'OISEL, *Mémoires*, Paris 1617, p. 198.

⁴² See GROSSEL, "Hélinand avant Froidmont" [above, n. 37].

ously mentioned remark by Vincent that Helinand lent some quires of the *Chronicon* to Guérin, with whom he was acquainted, without ever having them returned.⁴³

5. DBRP: Originally a Separate Work or a Section of the *Chronicon*?

It now needs to be ascertained if DBRP was ever conceived of as a separate, autonomous work by Helinand or if it originally formed part of his *Chronicon* and was subsequently excerpted from the *Chronicon* by Vincent of Beauvais. In the latter case, its independent existence originates in the intervention of the learned Dominican historian, and its status as an autonomous treatise and mirror for princes was the result of subsequent history.

As mentioned above, Vincent makes no mention of DBRP as a separate work by Helinand, as he does in case of the *Chronicon*, *De reparatione lapsi*, a work written in epistolary form, and the *Sermones*.⁴⁴ He introduces the three longer excerpts from Helinand that he incorporates into the *Speculum Historiale* as *Flores Helinandi* using the words 'Haec sunt autem quae de praefatis eius opusculis excerpsi, et in vnum hic apposui.' Within this group of 'praefatis opusculis' there is, however, no work entitled *de (bono) regimine principis*.

Although Molnár discusses the origin of ch. 38 of Book 11 in a way suggesting that he regarded DBRP as a formerly separate text inserted into the *Chronicon* at a later time,⁴⁵ he is rather obscure about his exact view on the matter. He argues that Helinand regrouped the abstracts from the *Policraticus* by John of Salisbury that appear in chapter 38 of *Chronicon* 11,⁴⁶ and entitled this chapter '*De institutione regum et principum*', a term encountered near the end of the chapter, where Helinand says (in Molnár's transcription):

⁴³ Cf. VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p. 1222a, referred to above, n. 8 and 9.

⁴⁴ VINCENT, *Spec. Hist.*, 29,108, ed. Douai, p.1222ab, see above, n. 22.

⁴⁵ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6], p. 185-186: 'Hélinand de Froidmont a regroupé les extraits du *Policraticus* dans le chapitre 38 du livre XI de son *Chronicon*. Nous exposons maintenant les conclusions auxquelles ont abouti nos recherches en vue de l'édition critique de ce chapitre dont le titre authentique est le suivant: *De institutione regum et principum*. [...] En faisant de nombreuses digressions, Hélinand insère dans son *Chronicon* de commentaires abondants et plusieurs traités autonomes. Notre texte figure parmi ces derniers; il se présente comme l'exégèse des fameux versets de Deutéronome (17, 14-20).'

⁴⁶ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6], p. 188: 'Les extraits du *Policraticus* choisis par Hélinand pour le *De institutione regum et principum*, sont empruntés à deux raisonnements particulièrement importants du traité de Jean de Salisbury. Le premier de ces raisonnements s'organise autour de l'exégèse des versets mentionnées du Deutéronome; et c'est précisément ce qui donne l'occasion à Hélinand d'introduire les extraits du *Policraticus* au livre XI de son *Chronicon*.'

Hucusque dictum sit De institutione regum et principum, qualiter se habere debeant uel domi uel militie, non solum secundum leges diuinas sed etiam humanas, que eatenus ualent, quatinus a diuinis non discrepant.⁴⁷

In his transcription of Helinand's text, Molnár capitalises the initial letter of 'de', thus making it look like a chapter title, although, in fact, the phrase 'de institutione regum et principum' has, in this sentence, the function of a prepositional determination to the predicate 'dictum sit'. At this point in the text, Helinand is summarising the contents of the chapter,⁴⁸ which he entitles 'Lex de rege constituendo'.⁴⁹ This title is mentioned alongside the chapter number in Book 11 and in the table of contents preceding this book on p. 269a of the Vatican MS. Moreover, this title also appears in the margin of the London MS (f. 185ra) containing, as noted above, an earlier version of Helinands *Chronicon*.⁵⁰ Molnár dismisses the title at the beginning of chapter 38 in the two manuscripts as a gloss, which only refers to the beginning of Dt. 17, 15,⁵¹ the verse being subject to commentary. He failed to realise that, in the Vatican MS, it is a chapter title and definitely not a gloss. Furthermore, all the chapters in this manuscript are provided with titles, which are additionally listed in the table of contents preceding each separate book. In the London MS, several of these chapter titles are preserved in the margin. Helinand announces by means of the title of ch. 38 of Book 11 that he intends to refer to Deuteronomy 17, 14 in considering how the Law (by which he may refer to the entire Mosaic law, only Deuteronomy, or just chapters 12-26 of Deuteronomy) deals with the appointment of a king. Since the ensuing verses of Deuteronomy list a number of behavioural rules with which a king should comply, Helinand continues his practice of citing John of Salisbury's *Policraticus* when discussing such topics, which he supplements by providing his views on the hierarchical relationship between the *leges diuinae* and the *leges humanae*.

If Helinand did not compose DBRP by courtly request and if he did not consequently write it as a separate text with a particular addressee in mind,

⁴⁷ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6], p. 185, n. 15.

⁴⁸ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 11, 38, Vatican MS, p. 294a: "**Auctor*** Hucusque dictum sit de institutione regum et principum, qualiter se habere debeant uel domi uel militie, non solum secundum leges diuinas, sed etiam humanas, que eatenus ualent quatinus a diuinis non discrepant. Alioquin falsum est quod in lege scriptum est **In lege***: 'Quod principi placet legis habet uigorem'. Nullas leges credunt quidam ciuilibus preferendas. **Anacharsis*** Sed has Anacharsis Seta telis aranee comparauit que muscas et culices detinent, et uolatilia grandiora transmittunt. Nunc ergo reliqua notabilia de libro Deuteronomii percurramus'; this text is partially quoted by Molnár, p. 185, n. 15.

⁴⁹ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 11, 38, Vatican MS, p. 282a.

⁵⁰ For the two versions see above, n. 10.

⁵¹ MOLNÁR, "De la morale" [above, n. 6], p. 185, n. 15.

the nature and relationship of the DBRP to Helinand's *Chronicon* needs to be reconsidered. To clarify these points, the *Chronicon* will, at first, be examined as a whole. A more specific discussion of Books 10 and 11 will then ensue.

The basis for Helinand's *Chronicon* is Jerome's translation of the chronicle written by Eusebius, as further amended by Sigebert and later historians (henceforth Eusebius-Jerome). This historiographic classic offered him a convenient framework for recounting universal history from creation to his own time.⁵² Since Eusebius-Jerome only starts with Abraham, Helinand was dependent on other sources for the history that precedes the first Jewish Patriarch dealt with by Helinand in Books 1-4 of his *Chronicon*, but Books 5-18 almost completely reproduce Eusebius-Jerome's historiographic data. The same holds true for the additions to Eusebius-Jerome made by Sigebert and his *continuatores* to cover the period from 634 to 1204 AD. The contents of these *continuationes* are almost entirely reiterated in Books 44-49 of the *Chronicon*.⁵³ Interspersing the sections taken from Eusebius-Jerome are extracts and comments that Helinand compiled from several sources.⁵⁴ Often, these additions consist of a few sentences, but more extensive insertions are also encountered. The secondary literature on Helinand and his method of compilation invariably identify these

⁵² Bishop Eusebius of Caesarea († 339) was the author of a universal history in two parts. The second part consisted of tables of the reigns of the rulers over the Hebrews, Assyrians, Egyptians, Greek, Romans and other nations of Antiquity. These tables started with the birth of Abraham and ended in the year 325 A.D. They are arranged in parallel columns in such a manner that events that occurred in the several nations are synchronically presented. By arranging the historical material in this manner, Eusebius tried to interconnect the chronologies of Israel and the other leading nations of classical Antiquity. Only a few fragments of the original Greek text of Eusebius survived, but the tables of the second part are completely preserved in a Latin translation by Jerome, who made several insertions into the text and appended a continuation until 378 AD. The Jerome redaction of Eusebius' *Chronica* was continued until the year 1111 by the Benedictine monk Sigebert of Gembloux († 1112), who dropped, however, the column lay-out that was based on the reigns of the emperors and kings. The Sigebert redaction was enlarged, in turn, with several additions.

In his *Chronicon*, Helinand did not maintain Eusebius-Jerome's column form and presented the material in a continuous text. In this way, he made it possible to conveniently insert and append shorter and longer extracts from other works, along with his own commentary. For the edition of the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle, see: *Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Hieronymi Chronicon* – ed. R. HELM, 3. Auflage, Berlin, 1984 (GCS, Eusebius Werke, Siebenter Band).

⁵³ In all probability, this also applies to Books 19 to 44. Since they are lost, it is unfortunately not possible to conclusively claim that Helinand adopted the Eusebius-Jerome structure for these books.

⁵⁴ For Helinand's method of compilation, see E.L. SAAK, "The Limits of Knowledge: Hélinand de Froidmont's Chronicon", in *Pre-Modern Encyclopaedic Texts. Proceedings of the Second COMERS Congress, Groningen, 1-4 July 1996* – ed. P. BINKLEY, Leiden-New York-Köln, 1997, pp. 289-302.

extensive insertions as ‘digressions’. Book 8 of the *Chronicon* provides a notable example of one such digression, as the entire book constitutes a supplement to the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle. In the last chapter of book 7, Helinand follows Eusebius-Jerome in discussing the death and burial of Joseph in Egypt. This subject matter offers Helinand a good opportunity to discuss topics that preoccupied him elsewhere in his writings: death, the origin and nature of the soul, its status after death, and its life in the hereafter. The entire lengthy book 8 is devoted to this fundamental discussion, which concludes with an explicit mention of Helinand’s return to the timeline of universal history in the next book:

Auctor Hucusque de origine et natura anime et de inferis et de diis paganorum dixisse sufficiat, occasione sumpta de morte Ioseph quem quidam Serapim putauerunt. Nunc ad ordinem hystorie libri noni principium reuertatur.⁵⁵

This signposting does, indeed, end the detour, as Helinand then rejoins the Eusebius-Jerome chronological scheme in the first sentence of Book 9: ‘Mortuus est igitur, ut diximus, Ioseph ...’

Readers are diverted along an equally long aside in Books 10 and 11. Similar to the end of Book 7 where the death of Joseph prompts Helinand to extrapolate his views on the soul, the death of Moses incites him to depart on an extensive excursion that encompasses all of Book 10 and most of Book 11. Undoubtedly, Helinand felt compelled to redress a lacune in Eusebius-Jeromes by providing more detail about the segment of Biblical history between the deaths of Joseph and Moses. Eusebius-Jerome deals mainly with Greek history during this period, and Helinand devotes the greatest part of its Book 9 to this subject. But the Cistercian monk of Froidmont clearly had a broader view of universal history, one that extended beyond Greek history alone, and the Bible was obviously an important source for him.

Moses’ birth is described in Exodus 2, and his death in Deuteronomy 34. Consequently, there are nearly four complete Bible books that Helinand’s *Chronicon* summarises, discusses and insets into universal history. It was impossible for Helinand to omit the exodus from Egypt, the journey of the Jews through the desert or the Giving of God’s Law. He therefore incorporated and discussed several passages from Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy within the scheme provided by Eusebius-Jerome, thus ensuring that his readership was familiar with at least the key points in the Pentateuch constituting the long digression of Books 10 and 11 and supplementing the contents of Genesis that had already been covered. Accord-

⁵⁵ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 8,75, Vatican MS, p. 202a.

ingly, he begins the first chapter of Book 10 with a justification for this intervention:

Compendiose exceptiones de libro Exodi Quoniam igitur hystorie series usque ad mortem Moysi nos perduxit, sicut de libro Geneseos notabilia queque in precedentibus libris huius nostri opusculi particulatim uel, ut ita dictum sit, frustatim excerpimus, sic ab hoc loco optima queque de libris Exodi, Leuitici, Numerorum, Deuteronomii breuiter annotabimus.

Invoking the method of '*(compendiose) exceptiones, notabilia, particulatim, frustatim, excerpere, optima queque*', he proceeds to discuss the segment of Biblical history from the birth of Moses to his death described in these four books of the Pentateuch. Almost at the end of Book 11 (at the beginning of chapter 54), Helinand concludes this collection of *notabilia* on the period from Exodus to Deuteronomy by stating that he is returning to the common timeline of universal history:

Sed hucusque exceptiones quatuor librorum posteriorum Moysi in duobus libellulis, idest decimo et undecimo, breuiter annotasse sufficiat. Nunc ad hystorie reuertamur ordinem, et seriem temporum sicut cepimus explicemus.⁵⁶

Echoing the end of Book 8, the reader is informed of a return 'ad hystorie ordinem'.⁵⁷ Since Moses remains alive at the end of Book 9, the beginning of Book 10 indicates that the 'hystorie series' (i.e. Eusebius-Jerome) jumps to the death of Moses. In Book 11, ch. 54, Helinand again returns 'ad hystorie ordinem', which enables him to continue as follows:

Igitur anno XL^a egressionis Israhel de Egypto, qui fuit annus Aminthe septimi decimi regis Assyriorum VIII^{us}, et Echirei quinti decimi Sithioniorum regis XL^{us}, uel secundum alia cronica XXX^{us}VIII^{us}, quia quedam exemplaria ponunt primum annum huius Echirei in primo anno ducatus Moysi, alia uero in anno tercio, et Danay decimi Argiuorum regis III^{us}, et Ericthonii quarti regis Atheniensium XVI^{us}, et Ramessis qui et Egyptus dictus est frater Danai XII^{us} qui regnabat XV^{us} in octaua decima Egyptiorum dinastia, *mortuus est Moses* legislator dux Hebreorum, *annor<um>*, ut dictum est, C^mXX^{ti}, *et fleuerunt eum filii Israhel XXX^a diebus*.⁵⁸

Therefore, it appears that Books 10 and 11, or more precisely, the section from the passage in Book 10, ch. 1 beginning with 'Quoniam igitur'

⁵⁶ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 11,54, Vatican MS p. 302a

⁵⁷ For a crucial discussion of Helinand's concept of *historia*, see M.M. WOESTHUIS, "Nunc ad historiam reuertamur: History and Preaching in Helinand of Froidmont", in *Sacris Erudiri*, 34 (1994), pp. 313-333.

⁵⁸ Cfr the Eusebius-Jerome chronicle, ed. R. HELM, p. 45a-45b.

to the first two sentences of Book 11, ch. 54 'Sed hucusque exceptiones [...] explicemus', deviates from the principal course of universal history. Helinand is marking time and does not immediately continue the main line of historical events recorded in Eusebius-Jerome. He takes the opportunity to largely elaborate on individual words, various ideas and complete sentences from the Bible books of Exodus through Deuteronomy. A global analysis of these 'digressive' sections of the *Chronicon* will cast some light on Helinand's manner of composition.

Helinand initially deals with selected topics from Exodus in Book 9. The last sentence of Book 9, ch. 4 reads: 'Hic incipit liber Exodi cuius Glosa in principio sic dicit', and the title of the following chapter announces a discussion on the first section of this Bible book: 'De principio libri Exodi'. However, the remainder of Book 9 only contains scattered discussions of Biblical issues intermingled among historiographic material. The serious and thorough treatment of the last four books of the Pentateuch does not begin until Book 10. The first seventy-three chapters of this book exclusively contain commentary on words and phrases of Exodus, beginning with the plagues in Egypt. Chapter 73 ends with a rubric statement indicating the end of the commentary on the second book of the Bible: 'Explicit de Exodo'.

Above the title of chapter 74 of Book 10 are the words 'Incipit de Leuitico' and the last chapter of this book (10,94) ends as follows: 'Hactenus de littera Leuitici breuiter dixisse sufficiat. Explicit liber decimus.' Book 11 starts with a chapter in which the meaning of the title for the Book of Numbers is explained, and continues with commentary on the Book of Numbers until the end of chapter 31, the last sentence of which is 'Explicit de libro Numeri'. The next chapter (11,32) opens the discussion of Deuteronomy:

De nomine et causa Deuteronomii <Capitulum> XXXII

Comestor* * Exceptiuncule de libro Deuteronomii 'Helle adabarim' uel 'helle debarim' interpretatur : 'hec sunt uerba'. Sic enim incipit liber Deuteronomii. Grece Deuteronomius, idest secunda lex, idest lex iterata, quia predicta hic iterantur.

Helinand concludes his comments on Deuteronomy in ch. 54 of Book 11, and, accordingly, his digression on the books of the Bible from Exodus to Deuteronomy also terminates with the remark referred to above.⁵⁹ He thereby indicates that the two books of annotations on the four last books by Moses are concluded, and that he returns to the ordinary timeline of

⁵⁹ See above, n. 56.

history: 'Sed hucusque exceptiones [...] annotasse sufficiat. Nunc ad hystorie reuertamur ordinem.'

As mentioned above, Helinand included excerpts of Biblical material from the Pentateuch in his treatment of Eusebius-Jerome in Book 9. The remainder of this Biblical material is then consolidated in the subsequent two books. In all probability, it was, originally, his intention to present a larger treatment of these Bible books but he abandoned this project for some reason. Such a change of plan is discernible in the two different final sentences of Book 10 in the two manuscripts. The London MS, which contains, as already said,⁶⁰ an older version of the *Chronicon*, ends this book as follows:

Hactenus de littera Leuitici dictum sit breuiter; nunc de sensu morali uel mistico simili breuiloquio percurramus.

Perhaps Helinand realised that it would be too ambitious to discuss the allegorical features of Leviticus after a literal exposition of the text. A reader of the London MS noticed this omission and wrote in the margin in a – very thin – handwriting 'deest'.⁶¹ In any case, Helinand must have deliberately abandoned any such scheme, as indicated in his revision of the *Chronicon* preserved in the Vatican MS, where the final sentence of Book 10 in this revised version does not mention any explanation of the mystical or allegorical sense of Leviticus and only refers to a discussion of the literal sense:

Hactenus de littera Leuitici breuiter dixisse sufficiat.

After the above general outline of the ways in which Helinand wove what he considered important topics (*notabilia queque*⁶²) of the Pentateuch into the Eusebius-Jerome narrative, it is now worthwhile to note the Deuteronomian material that he chose to include in Book 11. Chapters 32 through 53 of Book 11 mainly contain comments on separate words and statements from Deuteronomy. To a large extent, Helinand follows the order of occurrence of the selected *lemmata* in this Bible book: ch. 32: on the name of Deuteronomy; ch. 33: Dt. 2, 30 and 5, 8; ch. 34: Dt. 8, 3; ch. 35: Dt. 7, 1; ch. 36: Dt. 14, 1; ch. 37: Dt. 12, 6 and 18, 4 (on the *primitiae*); ch. 38: Dt. 17, 14-20 (*Lex de rege constituendo*); ch. 39: Dt. 14, 5 (on the meaning of *tragelaphus*); ch. 40: Dt. 20, 5-7; ch. 41: Dt. 22, 5; ch. 42: Dt. 23, 3; ch. 43: Dt. 25, 2-3 and 13 and Dt. 22, 9; ch. 44: Dt. 22,

⁶⁰ See above, n. 10.

⁶¹ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, London MS, f. 174va

⁶² Helinand uses the word '*notabilia*' at the beginning of Book 10, ch. 1 and at the end of Book 11, ch. 38.

10; ch. 45: Dt. 28, 68; ch. 46: Dt. 23, 16; ch. 47: Dt. 32, 5; ch. 48: Dt. 32, 8; ch. 49: Dt. 32, 42; ch. 50: Dt. 31, 24-29 and 33, 2; ch. 51: Dt. 33, 6; ch. 52: Dt. 33, 9; ch. 53: Dt. 34, 1-8; ch. 54: the concluding chapter.

At the beginning of ch. 38 Helinand quotes Augustine as he does, more than once, in his comments on Deuteronomy.⁶³ Dt. 17, 16 ('non multiplicabit sibi equos') sqq. leads him to quote several long passages from John of Salisbury's *Policraticus*,⁶⁴ the latter citing Dt. 17, 14-20 in its chapter 4. The factual commentary on the Deuteronomy text terminates with an explanation of Dt. 17, 20: 'Ut longo tempore regnet ipse et filius eius super Israel'. This part of Helinand's reflections on Deuteronomy is concluded by the famous example of the emperor Heliuss Adrianus, available to Helinand from the *Policraticus*.⁶⁵ This story facilitates a transition to the *Institutio Traiani* by Ps.-Plutarch, for which the *Policraticus* also was a source, and to supplement, expound and comment on the Ps.-Plutarch text. Helinand concludes this section with the following remark:

Auctor Hec autem de legibus breuiter excerpta per excessum quendam non prorsus inutilem nec usquequaque, ni fallor, incongruum suum hic locum teneant, ad pleniorē intelligentiam illius sententiae qua dictum est : *Iuste quod iustum est exequeris* [Dt. 16, 20], et quod de rege constituto dicitur in Deuteronomio : *Non declinet in dexteram uel in sinistram partem* [Dt. 17, 20].⁶⁶

In this way, Helinand returns to his excerpts from Deuteronomy and his commentary on them, in which he again incorporates material from the *Policraticus*. Incidentally, it appears that Helinand's *Chronicon* is the earliest witness to this text in the territory of present-day France. For him, it was an important text, one that he considered a source of paramount importance for his exegesis of Dt. 17, 14-20.

It is important to note that, in these chapters on Deuteronomy, Helinand focuses on explication of and commentary on what he considered to be essential Biblical actors, facts, events and customs, in short *notabilia*. Accordingly, *Chronicon*, Book 13, ch. 9 refers to the contents of Book 11, ch. 38 with the phrase 'Quedam utilia de Deuteronomio excerperemus'.⁶⁷

⁶³ Quotations from Augustine's *Quaestiones Deuteronomii* are also to be found in the chh. 33, 36, 37, 41, 46 and 47 of Book 11.

⁶⁴ I used two editions of the *Policraticus*: Ioannes Saresberiensis, *Policratici sive de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum libri VIII*, ed. C.C.J. WEBB, Oxford, 1909, I-II (reprint Frankfurt a. M., 1965) ; Ioannes Saresberiensis, *Policraticus* I-IV, ed. K.S.B. KEATS-ROHAN, Turnhout, 1993 (CC CM, 118).

⁶⁵ *Policraticus* 4, 11, ed. KEATS-ROHAN, p. 271, 174 ff.

⁶⁶ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 11, 38, Vatican MS, p. 292a-292b.

⁶⁷ Vatican MS, p. 367a.

It is obvious that Helinand intended to concisely elucidate the most interesting and important issues of the Bible books that he was discussing.⁶⁸ This intention of being concise also likely applied to chapter 38, entitled 'Lex de rege constituendo', although the chapter turned out to be much longer than its neighbours. Helinand probably knew that he had wandered off from the main subject and therefore almost apologetically emphasises the utility and the appropriateness of this digression, in writing: 'per excessum quendam non prorsus inutilem nec ...'⁶⁹ Notwithstanding its noteworthy size in comparison with the majority of the chapters of the Books 10 and 11 of the *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38 does not have any different status from the other chapters: It is part of Helinand's biblical exegesis. Accordingly, the last sentence of ch. 38 reads: 'Nunc ergo reliqua notabilia de libro Deuteronomio percurramus'.⁷⁰

6. *A Comparison of the Texts of Chronicon 11, 38 and DBRP in Vincent's Flores Helinandi*

As mentioned above,⁷¹ there are no explicit references to DBRP as an independent treatise written by Helinand in Vincent's survey of works by Helinand included in the bio-bibliographical section of his *Speculum Historiale*. At the same time, he does not mention Helinand's Book 11 as his source in his introduction to the excerpts that he edited in the *Flores*. However, the reference tag 'Helinandus lib.11' precedes Helinand's anecdote about Demosthenes in Book 3, ch. 91 of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, and a similar referencing practice is found in Vincent's *Speculum Doctrinale*. Books 4, ch. 65 and 7, ch. 16-106 of this work included large passages from Helinand's *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38 that are often but not always preceded by the reference tag 'Helinandus lib. 11' or 'Helinandus ubi supra'. Moreover, a closer inspection of the text reveals that Vincent used more than one large excerpt from this chapter in composing his *Speculum Doctrinale* without any reference to Helinand's work.⁷² In addition, the analysis of chapter 38 of Book 11 of Helinand's *Chronicon* demonstrates that this chapter is a coherently and systematically composed textual unit, which, in turn, perfectly fits into the sequence of Helinand's remarks on issues of Deuteronomy that he considered important. This Deuteronomy

⁶⁸ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 10,1, Vatican MS, p. 230b: 'optima queque de libris Exodi, Leuitici, Numerorum, Deuteronomii breuiter annotabimus.'

⁶⁹ See above, n. 66.

⁷⁰ HELINAND, *Chronicon*, 11, 38, Vatican MS, p. 294a.

⁷¹ See above, p. 391.

⁷² See e.g., the text quoted below, pp. 409-410.

commentary appears to be an organic part of Helinand's historical exegesis of the last four books of the Pentateuch and not a revised version of an earlier treatise.⁷³

In the present section, I intend to show that the method by which Vincent remade and adapted Helinand's *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38 was based on the trias of cutting, deleting and pasting, by means of which he created a new text. Such textual re-creation was a common practice in the learned world of the thirteenth century.⁷⁴ It is, in fact, the same method that Vincent applied when compiling the more strictly historical parts of the *Speculum Historiale* from the amazing quantity of sources that he had at his disposal.

An example of Vincent's method of cutting, deleting and pasting employed in the historical parts of his *Speculum Historiale* is provided by Vincent's makeover of Helinand's account of the dialogue between the Greek Cynic philosopher Diogenes (ca. 400 – ca. 325 B.C.) and the blind man. The methodology used in this redaction constitutes a model that was re-applied when re-fashioning chapter 38 in Book 11 of Helinand's *Chronicon* into the second text of the *Flores Helinandi* in the *Speculum Historiale*, Book 29, chapter 121-133.

Vincent entitles chapter 68 of Book 3 in the *Speculum Historiale* 'De Diogene et secta Cynicorum', and starts with a general introduction to the Cynic philosophers and their sect, which he borrows, as he says, from Eusebius, Augustinus, Cicero and Macrobius. The following part is the dialogue between Diogenes and the blind man. Vincent takes this story and Diogenes' remark: 'Superat conscientia quicquid mali confinxerat lingua' from Helinand's *Chronicon*, 17, ch. 4, which was entitled 'De Xenofonte et Antistene et Aristippo et Diogene', and introduces it providing the reference note: 'Helinandus 17. l.'. Helinand's section on Diogenes quotes another statement by Diogenes and immediately follows it with a discussion on Diogenes' master Antisthenes, Diogenes' austere way of life and his death. This part is omitted by Vincent; he concludes the excerpt from Helinand with Helinand's quotation of Seneca's words about Diogenes and appends the famous dialogue between Alexander the Great and Diogenes about the sunlight, an anecdote that he found in Valerius Maximus. Vincent does, however, use a considerable portion of the here excised Helinand text in the

⁷³ See above, p. 405.

⁷⁴ For Vincent of Beauvais as a compiler, see A.J. MINNIS, *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic literary attitudes in the later Middle Ages*, 2nd edition, Aldershot, 1988, pp. 154-155, 158-159 and *passim*. For Helinand and the encyclopaedic approach, see E.L. SAAK, "The Limits of Knowledge" [above, n. 54].

next chapter, but instead of mentioning Helinand's *Chronicon* as its source, he refers to Helinand's source, sc. Jerome, *Contra Iovinianum*, lib. II.

In this way, by changing the arrangement of the subject matter, deleting parts and adding new material, Vincent creates a text that has a different focus than that of his sources.

Helinand, <i>Chronicon</i> , 17, ch. 5 ⁷⁵	Vincent van Beauvais, <i>Spec. Hist.</i> , 3, ch. 68 (ed. Douai)
<p>De hoc eodem Diogene refertur quod cum aliquando sederet ad solem in crepidine uie, et in eum quidam cecus cum baculo offenderet, ait ad eum: "Tolle" inquit "oculum tuum", baculum eius oculum ipsius appellans. Cumque ille quereret quid ibi faceret, respondit "In uenatione sum, et quos capio, non habeo; quos autem non capio, hos habeo". Pediculos enim in uestimento querebat, et quos capiebat obterebat; ideo dicebat se captos non habere, non captos autem habere. Huius quoque Diogenis dicitur esse illa sententia: Superat conscientia quicquid mali confinxerit lingua.</p> <p>Diogenes tyrannos et subuersiones urbium bellaque *Ieronimus libro II contra Iovinianum de Diogene* uel hostilia uel ciuilia non pro simplici uictu holerum sed pro carnibus et dellitiis epularum asserit excitari. *Idem in eodem de Antistene* Antistenes cum gloriose docuisset rethoricam audissetque Socratem dixisse fertur ad discipulos suos "Abite, et magistrum uobis querite. Ego enim iam repperi", statimque uenditis que habebat et publice distributis, nichil sibi plus quam palliolum reseruauit. Paupertatis eius et laboris Xenofon testis est in Simphosio et innumerabiles libri eius quorum alios philosophico. Alios rethorico genere scribit. Huius Diogenes ille famosissimus sectator fuit, potentior rege Alexandro et nature humane uictor. Nam cum discipulorum Antistenes nullum reciperet et perseuerantem Diogenem remouere non posset, nouissime claua minatus est</p>	<p><i>Helinandus 17.l.</i></p> <p>De hoc etiam Diogene refertur, quod cum aliquando sederet ad solem in crepidine viae, et eum⁷⁶ quidam caecus cum baculo offenderet. Ait ad eum, tolle, inquit, oculum tuum, baculum eius oculum ipsius appellans. Cumque ille quaereret, quid ibi faceret, respondit, in venatione sum, et quos capio, non habeo, quos autem non capio, hos habeo, pediculos enim in vestimento quaerebat, et quia quos capiebat obterebat; ideo dicit se captos non habere, non captos autem habere. Huius autem Diogenis dicitur esse illa sententia: superat conscientia, quicquid mali confinxerit lingua:</p>

⁷⁵ Thanks are due to Dr. J.B. Voorbij, who kindly permitted me to use his transcription of Book 17 of Helinand's *Chronicon*.

⁷⁶ *Spec. Hist.*, 4, 68, ed. RUSCH, Strasbourg, c. 1473 reads: "et ui eum".

<p>nisi abiret. *Diogenes ad Antistenem* Cui ille subiecisse dicitur caput atque dixisse: "Nullus tam durus baculus erit, qui me a tuo possit obsequio separare". *Satirus libro III uirum illustrium de uita Diogenis* De hoc Diogene refert Satirus quod duplici palio usus sit propter frigus, peram pro cellario habuerit, clauam ob corpusculi fragilitatem qui iam senex membra sustentare solitus erat, et Amorobios uulgo appellatus sit, in presentem horam poscens a quolibet et accipiens cibum. Habitauit</p> <p>autem in portarum uestibulis et in poncibus ciuitatum. Cumque se contorqueret in dolio uolubilem se habere domum iocabatur, et se cum temporibus commutantem. Frigore enim os dolij uertebat in meridiem, estate ad septemtrionem, et ubicumque se sol inclinauerat Diogenis simul pretorium uertebatur. Quodam uero tempore habens ad potandum {-} lineum, uidit puerum concaua manu bibere et elisise fertur illud ad terram, dicens *De morte Diog<enis>* "Nesciebam quod natura poculum haberet". Virtutem autem eius et continentiam mors quoque indicat. Nam cum ad agonem Olimpiacum qui magna frequentia Grece celebrabatur, iam senex pergeret feбри in itinere apprehensus, accubuisse in crepidine uie. Volentibus autem eum amicis aut in iumentum aut in uehiculum tollere non acquieuit, sed transiens ad arboris umbram locutus est eis dicens: "Abite, queso, et spectatum pergite. Hec me mox aut uictorem probabit aut uictum. Si febrem uicero, ad agonem ueniam. Si me uicerit febris, ad inferna descendam". Ibi-que per noctem eliso gutture non tam mori se ait quam febrem morte excludere.</p> <p>De hoc Diogene pulchre ait Seneca: Potentior erat Diogenes omnia possidente Alexandro. Plus enim erat quod iste nollet accipere quam quod ille posset dare.</p>	<p>de hoc Diogene pulchre ait Seneca: potentior erat Diogenes omnia possidente Alexandro, plus enim erat quod iste nollet accipere, quam quod ille posset dare.</p>
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The same method of compilation is employed by Vincent in his revision or rather remake of Helinand's chapter on the king, his officials and subjects that was part of his historic-exegetical commentary on Deuteronomy. Vincent follows the structure of Helinand's chapter in broad lines but divides it into smaller chapters with individual chapter titles that have

a programmatic function. He omits extensive parts of Helinand's text in order to provide better structure for the new text, to make it easier to read and to ensure better correspondence with the newly introduced chapter titles, some of which are borrowed from the marginalia that he found in the manuscript of Helinand's chronicle. This revised part of Helinand's Deuteronomy commentary has become a text on its own (*sui iuris*), although it deals with the same topics and issues of the original, sc. the king, his officials and subjects, their required moral, intellectual and spiritual qualities, and their mutual privileges and duties. Its character and focus has essentially changed, however. In effect, Vincent created not only a new text but also laid the foundations for a new framework within which it could function. As mentioned above⁷⁷, this reworking activity did not prevent Vincent from using large parts of Helinand's Book 11, ch. 38 elsewhere in his oeuvre, whether or not preceded by a reference note. To illustrate the way in which Vincent incorporated ch. 38 of Book 11 in his text, the entire section of ch. 38 that deals with the greed and avarice of civil servants and courtiers (*De disciplina officialium*)⁷⁸ is presented below. Different fonts are used to indicate Vincent's adaptation of it in the *Flores Helinandi* of the *Speculum Historiale* 29, ch. 128 and Vincent's borrowings from this section of the *Chronicon* in the *Speculum Historiale* 3, ch. 91 and the *Speculum Doctrinale* 4, ch. 65 and 7, ch. 21-22. The text printed in 11-pt roman type occurs in Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*, and in *Spec. Hist.* 3, 91, and in *Spec. Doctr.* 4, 65 and 7, 21-22. The two words that only occur in the *Flores* are in bold. The text *only* encountered in *Spec. Hist.* 3, 91 and *Spec. Doctr.* 4, 65 or in 7, 22 is printed in 11-pt italics. Finally, the text that is only found in Helinand's *Chronicon* 11, 38 is printed in 9-pt italics. The array of fonts clearly reveals the parts of the section on *De disciplina officialium* in Helinand's *Chronicon* 11,38 that Vincent omitted (i.e. the text printed in 9-pt italics) when composing the *Flores* (i.e. the text in 11-pt roman) and the parts of *Chronicon* 11,38 that he re-used only outside the framework of the *Flores Helinandi* (i.e. the text in 11-pt italics):

[MS *Vat. lat.* 535, pp. 287a-288b]⁷⁹ *De disciplina officialium* Sequitur de potestate et officialium disciplina. Nichil iniquo diuitis consiliario perniciosius. Vnde *In Prouerbis*: "Omni custodia serua cor tuum, quoniam ex ipso uita procedit". Est igitur prouidendum potestati ne consilarii eius indigeant neue aliena immoderatius concupiscant. "Nichil est scelestius quam amare pecuniam ;

⁷⁷ See above, p. 392.

⁷⁸ This part of the *Chronicon* has only been preserved in the Vatican manuscript.

⁷⁹ The sections between asterisks are found in the margin of the Vatican manuscript. For their function and origin, see E.R. SMITS, "Editing the Chronicon of Helinand of Froidmont: the marginal notes", *Sacris Erudiri*, 32 (1991), pp. 269-289. I have omitted the minor textual differences that do not concern Vincent's compilation method.

hic enim animam suam uenalem habet” et “*in uita sua proiecit intima sua*”. Igitur non solum in corde, idest in consiliario, sed etiam in uentre et intestinis rei publice, idest questoribus et comentariensibus hec ratio seruanda est. In lateribus quoque, idest illis qui semper principi assistunt. Nam a conuictu mores formantur, et “qui tangit picem inquinabitur ab ea”. “Vuaque **conspecta**” (uel *secundum aliam litteram* : contacta) “liuorem ducit ab uua”.

De auaricia potestatum et officialium Ita quidam legati sedis apostolice in prouinciis debachantur ac si ad ecclesiam flagellandam egressus sit sathan a facie domini. Sic uersantur ac si in Thebas [Tedas V] in facinus excitandas mittatur ab inferis Thesiphone uel Megea. Apud hos

*iudicium non est nisi publica merces,
atque eques in causa est qui sedet emptya probat.
Vixque tenent lacrimas cum nil lacrimabile cernunt.*

Acceptores personarum et quasi quidam bonorum mallei. Vnde **Iuuenalis** :

Omne animi uitium tanto conspectius in se
crimen habet, quanto maior qui peccat habetur.

Episcorum nomen et officium uenerabile esset, si tanta impleretur sollicitudine quanta interdum petitur ambitione ; et diligerentur ut patres, timerentur ut domini, colerentur ut sancti, si exactionibus parcerent et proicerent ex animo quicquid prouenit ex calupnia nec omnem questum pietatem putarent.

De auaricia curialium In domibus prelatorum et principum omnia hodie uenalia sunt, cum a Cosso digrederis superest Vegento, portitor immitis Charon clementior istis. Stipe siquidem uel triente solet esse contentus. At isti asses integros sibi multiplicari iubent. Frustra apud curiales de testimonio conscientie, de uenustate morum, de torrente eloquentie, nisi precio interueniente confidis. [p. 287b V]

Ipse licet uenias musis comitatus, Homere,
si nil attuleris, ibis Homere foras.

*Orpheus non modo leones et tigrides eloquentie beneficio lenisse dictus est, sed et apud ipsum Ditem uox eius melle dulcior perorauit ut amissam semel Euridicem contra morem inferorum liceret educere. Tu uero, licet sis Orpheus aut Arion qui sono testudinis saxa ut dicitur emolliuit, nichil apud curiales efficies, nisi corda eorum plumbea in aurea uel argentea uanitatis aut cupiditatis incude emollias. Inclementiam Cherberi omnes abhorrent. Ego credo me uidisse ostiarios Cherbero duriores. Apud inferos tamen Cherberus, ut aiunt, unus est. Sed quot sunt diuertacula curiarum tot Cherberi : tota familia aut mordet aut latrat. Vetus prouerbius est **Prouerbius** : “Vacue manus temeraria peticio est”. Importunus precator est qui dandas res ad uerba confidit. Verba medicorum et curialium sunt hec :*

*Pro solis uerbis montanis utimur herbis,
pro caris rebus pigmentis et speciebus.*

De auaricia aduocatorum Apud⁸⁰ aduocatos quoque et ipsum silentium uenale est. **Exemplum a Demostene** Hoc fortassis a Demostene acceperunt. Qui cum Aristodimum auctorem fabularum interrogasset quantum mercedis uti ageret

⁸⁰ In the *Speculum Doctrinale*, 4, 65, the quotation from Helinand’s *Chronicon* is preceded by the reference tag: “Helinandus lib. 11”.

accepisset, et respondisset : “talentum”; “at ego”, ait Demostenes, “plus accepi ut tacerem”. Causidicorum lingua dampnifica est, nisi eam ut dici solet funibus argenteis uincias. *Aliud exemplum de eodem* Idem Demostenes cum a senatu Atheniensium in patrocinium peteretur contra Philippum regem Macedonum simulata infirmitate, ut aiunt, lecto decubuit et respondit his qui ad se conuenerant se pati morbum sinancem ; cui a quodam ex nuntiis mordacissime responsum est : certe non sinancem pateris, immo arginantem.⁸¹ *Seneca* Nichil autem, ut ait Seneca, uenali misericordia turpius. Iniustum prorsus est misericordiam uendere siue iusticiam. Quod autem iniustum est usquequaque non licet, ut nec pro temporali uita fieri liceat. Quod enim iustum est mercedis interuentu non indiget, cum per se fieri debeat et iniquum sit uendere quod debetur. Iusticiam ergo uendere iniquum est, iniusticiam iniqua insania. Vt autem uulgo dicitur compugnantibus iniquis uincere consuevit qui uiribus superior est. Quod uero in aliis contractibus non repperitur, solus ille iusticiam uendit qui non habet. Licet a patrono merces ex causa honorarii debeat, tamen concinnatorem uel redemptorem litium esse non decet, ut certe partis emolumentum cum graui dampno litigatoris et quadam depredatione paciscatur. Et quamuis secundum leges humanas patrocinium iustum possit uendere aduocatus et peritus iuris sanum consilium, iudici tamen iudicium uendere omnino non licet. In lege scriptum est: “Iuste quod iustum est exqueris”.

Quod munera a iudicibus accipienda non sunt Summa continentia [p. 288 V] a muneribus omnibus magistratibus indicta est adeo ut qui ordinatam gesserit potestatem, quicquid ex uetere delegationis titulo profligauerit, cum dispendio pudoris atque fortune, idest honoris atque dignitatis, de propriis facultatibus intra prouinciam positus [Cod. Iust. poterit is V] inferre cogatur. *De lege Iulia* Lege quoque Iulia repetundarum tenetur qui cum haberet aliquam potestatem ob iudicandum uel non iudicandum, discernendum uel non discernendum, testimonium denuntiandum uel non denuntiandum pecuniam acceperit, et in summa quo magis aut minus quid ex officio faceret. Hoc usucapi potest quod accipitur antequam redeat in potestatem eius a quo profectum est aut heredis. Hec uerba legis sunt : Vt unius, inquit, pena possit esse metus multorum, ducem qui male egit ad prouinciam quam nudauerat cum custodia competenti ire precipimus, ut non solum quod egit non dicam domesticus sed manipularius ac minister accepit, uerum ut id quod ipse a prouincialibus meis accepit aut sustulit, quadruplum inuitus exsoluat. Itemque : Omnes cognitores ac iudices a pecuniis et patrociniis manus abstineant, neque alienum iurgium suam putent predam. Item : Iubemus quoque et hortamur ut si quis forte honoratorum, decurionum, possessorum, postremo etiam colonorum a cuiuslibet ordinis iudice fuerit qualibet ratione concussus, si quis sciat uenalem de iure fuisse sententiam, si quis penam uel precio remissam uel uicio cupiditatis ingestam ; si quis postremo quacumque de causa in proprium iudicem potuerit approbare, is uel administrante eo uel post administrationem depositam in publicum prodeat, deferat crimen, delatum approbet, cum probauerit et uictoriam reportaturus et gloriam.

Quid sit usucapio Est autem usucapio adiectio domini, seu acquisitio per continua[tia]tionem possessionis longi temporis diffinita. In rebus mobilibus usucapio hodie recepta est. Excipiun-

⁸¹ arginantem, cfr ἀργυροῦν, silver quinsy; *Spec. Hist.* 3,91 and *Spec. Doctr.* 4, 65 only contain the section ‘Qui cum ... arginantem’, both, however, with the same informative variant, sc. ‘Demosthenes’ instead of ‘Qui’; *Spec. Doctr.* 7, 21-22 only contains the section ‘Apud aduocatos... uincias’.

*tur res sacre et religiose et fiscales et publice pupillares et furtiue et ui possesse. Cause siquidem que usucapionem inducunt iustum initium et titulum et bonam fidem desiderant. Vsucapio in mobilibus est tantum, longa possessio in immobilibus, per que duo uerba differentia mancipi et nemancipi sublata est. Tempus autem usucapionis prefinitum, triennium continuum est. Plebisscito etiam continetur ne quis presidum [presidium V] munus donumue caperet nisi esculentum poculentumue et id quidem intra dies proximos prodigatur. Sed nec xenia producenda sunt ad munerum qualitatem. De talium muneribus ait epistola Seueri imperatoris *Seuerus imperator*: Vetus prouerbium est 'Nec omnia, nec semper, nec ab omnibus.' Nam ualde inhumanum est a nemine accipere, passim u<i>lissimum [p. 288b V], per omnia auarissimum. Nunc autem sic omnes post munera currunt, ac si alibi laborum requies dolorumque solatium inueniri non possit, ac si naufragi de periculo facilius enatent, si pregrandi sarcina onerentur. Quis ulcerosus unquam spinas conguessit ut super eas mollius quiesceret?*

As can be gleamed from the above example, Vincent's, extraction of the text from its specific Pentateuch-Deuteronomy context, radical reworking of it and its subsequent casting into a separate section of the *Flores Helinandi* resulted in the forging of a new work. Vincent's re-invention of Helinand's text had the effect that, within a few decades, a *Liber de regimine principum* sprang to life.⁸²

7. Final Remarks

There are no indications in Book 11, ch. 38 of Helinand's *Chronicon* to suggest that any parts of a previously composed treatise is being recopied or re-used. In all known cases when the Cistercian historian inserted re-used material, he usually introduced it with a personal reference or indication of its previous conception.

Furthermore, Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale* does not contain any references to a separate, autonomous DBRP. In quoting from Book 11, 38 in the *Speculum Doctrinale*, Vincent explicitly refers several times to passages from Helinand's *Chronicon* that he also cites in the *Flores Helinandi* of his *Historiale*. Admittedly, large parts of Helinand's *Chronicon* 11, 38 are not reproduced in the *Flores Helinandi*, but some of these sections are, nevertheless, cited and referenced in the *Speculum Doctrinale*. Vincent clearly had full knowledge of this text and quoted from it selectively.

In Vincent's *Flores Helinandi*, DBRP is divided into thirteen systematical-ly-ordered chapters that, although they largely follow the textual sequence of *Chronicon*, Book 11, ch. 38, sometimes deviate from Helinand's structure. This division into thirteen chapters and the corresponding chapter

⁸² See above, p. 392.

titles do not occur in the *Chronicon* and have no counterpart in the *Speculum Doctrinale*.

Contemporary views on the early history of the mirror-of-princes genre are predominantly based on Berges' study, which is the immediate source of the commonly held belief that DBRP was originally composed by Helinand as a separate, self-contained treatise commissioned by the French court. To support this view, Berges relied on Oudin's *De scriptoribus*. This Praemonstratensian scholar exercised a good measure of imagination in combining remarks made by Du Boulay about Helinand's role as a singer at the court of Philip Augustus and a reference by De Visch to a manuscript containing the text of DBRP in a monastic library at Tongeren. These somewhat fanciful connections underlie Oudin's conclusion that Helinand composed DBRP as a mirror for princes commissioned by the French king.

As previously demonstrated by Hans Hublocher⁸³ in 1913, and recently endorsed by such scholars as Baldwin and Molnár, Helinand clearly incorporated a lot of the ideas and commentary on the conduct of monarchs that John of Salisbury, prompted by Dt. 17, 14-20, made in his *Policraticus*. He furthermore connected these texts to Ps.-Plutarch's *Institutio Traiani*, which he also found in John's *Policraticus* and which he outfitted with substantial annotation. This implies that Helinand did not first compose a separate mirror for princes commissioned by the French court that was subsequently expanded and incorporated in his commentary and exegesis of *Deuteronomy* included in his *Chronicon*. In fact, the derivation was the inverse. The circulation of Helinand's *Chronicon* was very limited, and the subsequent redaction of DBRP that Vincent adapted and edited in his *Flores Helinandi* was widely distributed among medieval scholars as part of Vincent's *Speculum Historiale*, a historiographic best-seller in the Middle Ages. Unacquainted with the original *Chronicon* version, the late-medieval and early-modern scholars conferred the status of a self-contained treatise to the Vincent redaction. In this way Helinand's compiled commentary on Dt. 17, 14-20 became, thanks to intervention and redaction of Vincent of Beauvais, an important part of the European tradition of moralistic-didactic mirrors for princes.⁸⁴

Summary

Book 11 of the Universal History composed by the Cistercian monk Helinand of Froidmont in the first decades of the thirteenth century contains a compre-

⁸³ H. HUBLOCHER, *Helinand von Froidmont und sein Verhältnis zu Johannes von Salisbury. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Plagiates in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*, [Beilage zum Jahresberichte des K. Neuen Gymnasiums zu Regensburg für das Studienjahr 1912-1913], Regensburg, 1913.

⁸⁴ Thanks are due to Dr. Robert Olsen for help with the English translation.

hensive chapter entitled 'Lex de rege constituendo'. About half of this chapter has been edited as a separate treatise under the title 'De bono regimine principis' in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 212. Today, it is commonly considered to be a Mirror for Princes.

Twentieth-century scholarship generally claims that 'De bono regimine' originally existed as an independent treatise composed by Helinand under commission of King Philip Augustus of France and subsequently inserted – by Helinand himself – in his *Chronicon*.

This view appears, however, to be based on an error that originated in Oudin's *Commentarius* (1722) and that has gained increasing acceptance in modern scholarship since having been adopted by Wilhelm Berges in his pioneering study *Die Fürstenspiegel* in 1938. The misconception is all the more remarkable given the lack of any evidence for the existence of a Mirror of Princes by Helinand in his own writings or in Vincent of Beauvais' *Speculum Historiale*, which was the most important witness for Helinand's life and works in the Middle Ages. A closer inspection of Book 11 provides evidence for a reversal of the accepted chronology. Books 10 and 11 constitute a commentary on the Bible books of *Exodus* through *Deuteronomy*. The chapter of Book 11 entitled 'Lex de rege constituendo' is a regular and systematic continuation of this commentary. Though longer than the surrounding chapters, it is not essentially different from them; the chapter is part of a biblical exegesis and not an instructive guide for princes. Furthermore, the exegetical character of this chapter must have been clearly apparent from the very beginning of its conception. The present text 'De bono regimine' was excerpted by Vincent of Beauvais from the *Chronicon*, abbreviated, restructured and included as an independent text in the *Speculum Historiale*. The above-mentioned misreading then caused it to gain the status of a separate treatise composed by order of the French King.